Socinianism Unmask'd.

A

DISCOURSE

Shewing the

Unreasonableness

Of a Late

Writer's OPINION

Concerning the Necessity of only

One Article of Christian Faith;

And of his other Assertions in his late Book, Entituled,

The Reasonableness of Christianity as deliver'd in the Scriptures, and in his *Vindication* of it.

With a Brief Reply to another (professed) Socinian Writer.

By *JOHN EDWARDS*, B. D. and sometime Fellow of S. *John's* College in *Cambridge.*

LONDON: Printed for *J. Robinson* at the *Golden Lyon*, and *J. Wyat* at the *Rose* in S. *Paul's* Church-yard. M DC XC VI.

THE

INTRODUCTION.

THE following Diſcourſe (which was finiſh'd above two months ago, but by reaſon of ſome Intervening Occurrences found not its way to the Preſs) is deſign'd againſt the undertaking of a late Author in his book which bears the Title of *the Reaſonableneſs of Chriſtianity*, &c. But the Writer himſelf is wonderfully pleaſed with his Lying hid, and being No Body. I grant there may be Reaſons why a man may ſometimes conceal his Name, and not prefix it to the Book he is Au-

thor of. But there are ſome Reaſons that are proper and peculiar to this Writer's circumſtances, for this is perfectly after the Mode of our late *Engliſh Racovian* Writers, who conſtantly appear *Nameleſs*, and accordingly herein he ſhews himſelf to be of the right *Racovian* breed. And another good reaſon is this (which indeed argues ſomething of Modeſty) he would not ſet a *Chriſtian Name* before that book wherein he ſo groſly abuſes *Chriſtianity*, and renounces the greateſt part of it.

I will not waſt time, and trouble the Reader and my ſelf about gueſſing who this Writer is. Out of Chriſtian good will and charity I am backward to believe that he who is vogued to be the Father of theſe Extravagant Conceits, is really ſo. I will ſtill perſwade my ſelf

ſelf that there is *an Error of the Perſon*; upon which account I ſhall be more free than otherwiſe I ſhould have been.

But to come to the Book it ſelf; there was (to expreſs it in the moſt Learned and Rhetorical Stile of our Author himſelf) a *great flutter, noiſe and buz*, raiſed about it, even while it was yet under the Printers hands. There were certain Factors and Emiſſaries who extravagantly extolled it, and it was obſerv'd this Applauſe came from the *Racovian* quarter. Thoſe of that way knew before it came out that it was in favour of their Cauſe: whence it was that they ſo mightily raiſed the Expectations of thoſe they convers'd with, and highly magnified this Piece before the world had ſeen it. And as ſoon as it was bleſſed with the

ſight of it, their language ran to an exorbitant heighth: as if *Chriſtianity* had been never known before the time of the compiling of this book. All that went before this Author were deluded Creatures, and were perfect Strangers to the Articles of the Chriſtian Faith, and to Chriſtianity it ſelf. Now is riſen up an Infallible Teacher: all muſt obſequiouſly repair to this Great Oracle. Now the *Socinians* have another Champion, now they look brisk upon it, and the day is their own. Now Converts come in apace, and the Youth begin to have a *Polonian* Aſpect: and in a ſhort time we ſhall have a Brood of *Socinians*, we ſhall be ſtock'd with Young *Racovians*.

And to let you into the whole Project, this is the ſhort account of it, *Socinianiſm* was to be erected at

at this time (they can ſtay no longer) and in order to that all hands are to be employed, *i. e.* all that they can get. Among others they thought and made choice of a Gentleman, who they knew would be extraordinarily uſeful to them; and he it is probable was as forward to be made uſe of by them, and preſently accepted of the Office which was aſſigned him. Now, thinks he, I had beſt to make uſe of this opportunity, and to ſet up for a *Divine*. Not only *the Illiterate bulk of mankind, but their Reverences and Right Reverences* (to uſe the words of *a* * *Writer of our own Brotherhood*) ſhall come to Me to have their underſtandings in-

* The Exceptions of Mr. *E.* againſt the *Reaſonableneſs of Chriſtianity*, &c. examined.

form'd, for we have but a ſorry unthinking ſort of *Teachers* now a-days, whether they be Conformiſts or otherwiſe: I could never approve of their *Syſtematick* genius, their doating upon *Creeds* and *Confeſſions*, and rendring our Faith cumberſom and burdenſom. It may be even theſe men will give ear to what a *Thoughtful Muſing* Man dictates to them, though they never *think* themſelves, but take all upon truſt, and ſwallow *Epiſtles* and *Goſpel* together. I have attained to ſuch a heighth and perfection of knowledg that I am able to inſtruct theſe people after another rate. I muſt tell them (which I know they will look very ſtrangely upon) that the Apoſtles, when they wrote the *Epiſtles* to their Chriſtian Converts, deſigned not to trouble their heads with

with any *Articles* or *Truths* that were neceſſarily to be believed, they only dropt a few *Occaſional* Documents. And it may be now and then that *One Article* which I have propounded to the world may be hook'd in by the by: but that is no place to look for any Neceſſary and Fundamental Truth of Chriſtianity, which is abſolutely to be believ'd by us.

This ſeems to be Novel Doctrine, and ſo indeed it is, for I have the honour to be the firſt famous Inventer of it; but I doubt not but in a ſhort time I ſhall not only propagate this, but the *Cauſe* to which it is ſubſervient, in a wonderful manner. To this purpoſe I will carry it cunningly: whileſt the *Double-Column'd Prints* are openly and in a down-right way advancing the Cauſe, I will do as much

ſer-

ſervice under-hand. They look directly towards *Poland* or *Tranſylvania*, they publickly profeſs themſelves to be *Socinus*'s Followers, but I'll be upon the Reſerve, and ſo diſguiſe my ſelf that it ſhall be very difficult to diſcover me. I will make the world believe that I never heard of ſuch a man as *Socinus*: and if they tell me that I ſpeak his very language as perfectly as if I were a Native of *Sienna*, I'll face them down that I had it not by fingring of any Socinian Authors, but by a kind of *Natural Revelation*.

Well, this cauſe muſt be carried on, and I can do it as well as any man by maintaining that there is but *One Article of Chriſtian Faith neceſſarily to be believ'd to make a man a Chriſtian*, neceſſarily to be believ'd in order to ſalvation. For if there be

be but One Point neceſſary to be believ'd, then the doctrines concerning the *Trinity*, concerning the *Incarnation* and *Divinity of Chriſt*, concerning his *Satisfaction*, &c. are rendred unneceſſary as to the making us Chriſtians. And this I will ſhove on under the colour of being ſerviceable to *the bulk of Mankind*, of being obliging and merciful to the *Multitude* and *Rabble*, and *Poor People*; though (to ſay the Truth) I ſhew my ſelf to be ſo far from obliging the Multitude that I do them an infinite deal of Miſchief. Yet if I compaſs my End, it is enough, and I care for no more. And my End is this, to hale in *Socinianiſm* after a new manner.

You ſee what the *Muſing* of this Gentleman comes to: and I was ſo unhappy a man as to find it out,

to

to take notice of it, and to discover it to the world in a late *Discourse* which I publish'd; and thereby I have extremely exasperated this New Undertaker and his Adherents. I do not wonder at it, for now their Intrigues are laid open, their *Racovian* Plot is detected, and all their Measures are thereby broken.

But to keep up their hearts, a *Vindication* (as it is call'd) of this Treachery is publish'd by him who was appointed to be the Chief Tool in this work. Here he makes it his business to defend his New Paradox, and to shore his Notion up again with some crazy props. Throughout the whole he is pleas'd to Criticize with some Magisterialness and Pertness on the Reflections which I made on his book

book. And now it is my turn again to be Critick, and I ſhall diſcharge the Task with all impartiality and integrity. It is true, there is nothing of any Moment, nothing Weighty and Argumentative in what he hath offered, and therefore ſome in whoſe Judgment I could confide, would have prevailed with me to add no more on this Subject, which they were perſwaded I had before ſufficiently cleared: but partly to ſhew ſomewhat further the great Danger and Miſchief of this Writer's Opinion, partly to prevent the Seduction of ſome well-meaning perſons who may be apt to be led away by his ſmooth Pretences, (for though his Cavils and Evaſions be weak, yet they may chance to light into the Hands of ſome Weak Rea-

Readers, ſuch as are not well eſtabliſh'd in their notions: Wherefore not on the account of his Petty Objections, but for the ſake of theſe perſons I reaſſume this Argument) and partly to lay open the Wilful Miſtakes and Groſs Diſſimulation (as I take it) of this Writer, and partly to gratifie thoſe Gentlemens expectations who with ſome impatience ſeem to long for a Reply, I have once again undertaken to employ the Preſs upon this occaſion. But the Chief and Principal Deſign, as well as Motive, of my appearing again in this Cauſe is to aſſert and defend the *Chriſtian Faith* which this Author hath miſrepreſented, maim'd and abuſed. To which purpoſe I will ſet before the Reader the Heads of his pretended *Vindication*, and in the face

of

of the world make it appear how falſly and perfidiouſly he hath acted in the Cauſe of Religion. And may it be the Readers Prayer (as well as it is mine) that this Enterprize may tend to the Glory and Honour of *God the Father*, *God the Son*, and *God the Holy Ghoſt* (Three Glorious Perſons in One ever to be Adored Deity) and to the Edification of the *Chriſtian* Church. *Amen.*

Jan. 27.
169⅞.

ERRATA.

PAge 17. line. 1. read *World*. p. 22. l. 18. for *Christ. r. Jesus*. p. 54. l. 20. r. *Sylburgius*. p. 84. l. 9. r. *Racovians*. p. 87. l. 23 after *Jesus* insert *Christ*. p. 116. line 3. after *done* make the other part of the *Parenthesis*. p. 117. l. 18. after *if* insert *the truth were known, I believe it would appear that*. p. 120. l. 17. r. *telling*. p. 125. l. 8. r. *him*. p. 128. l. 21. after *hath* insert *had*. p. 131. l. 13. after *religion* insert *who is so near a-kin to one that is voted a Socinian in the Brief History of the Unitarians*. p. 135. l. 11. r. *Socinianiz'd*.

A Late WRITER's *Unreaſonable Opinions* CONFUTED.

CHAP. I.

The firſt General Charge againſt the Late Writer, viz. *That* he unwarrantably crowds all the Neceſſary Articles of Faith into One, *with a deſign of favouring* Socinianiſm. *He endeavours to ſhift off the Enditement, but is caſt by his own words. His wilful miſtake about the Article of the* Deity. *He labours in vain to ſplit One Article into Two. It is ſhew'd that beſides the bare believing of* Jeſus to be the Meſſias, *it is neceſſary to know and believe the Fall of* Adam, *whereby Sin and Death entred into the World, and were derived to his poſterity. It is neceſſary to know and believe* Who *the* Meſſias *is; whether he be God or Man, or both: on*

which will follow the neceſſary belief of the Holy Trinity. *It is requiſite to have a right conception concerning our* Recovery *and* Reſtauration *by the* Meſſias, *i. e. to know what he undertook and did for us, and to be acquainted with the Great* Privileges *beſtow'd upon us by him. It is of neceſſity to believe what the* Meſſias *requires of Us. It is undoubted matter of our belief, that our Salvation ſprings from the mere Favour and Grace of God through* Chriſt Jeſus, *and not from any works or merits of ours. It is indiſpenſably requiſite, that we believe the Doctrin of the* Reſurrection, *of the* Final Judgment, *and of* Eternal Life.

I Will now betake my ſelf to the Task which is before me, after I have told the Reader, that I intend not to imitate our Nameleſs Author in his Childiſh Flouriſhes, in his Spruce and Starched Sentences, and in his Impotent Jeſtings, which are ſprinkled up and down his *Vindication*. Nor will I follow him in his Impertinencies and Incoherencies, in his trifling Excurſions to eke out his two ſheets and a half. I will not reſemble him in his little

Little Artifices of evading, in his weak and feeble Struglings with a Strong Truth. I will not perſonate him in the Confuſion and Diſorder of his Reply, for it ſeems he had forgot, that it is one ſign of a *Well-bred, a Well taught Man,* * *to anſwer to the firſt in the firſt place,* and ſo in order. I will not imitate him in his Dry Common Places, in his Set of Words and Phraſes, of Sayings and Apothegms, which would have ſerv'd on any other occaſion, as the Intelligent Reader cannot but take notice. Much leſs will I comply with him in his Angry fits and Paſſionate Ferments, which, tho he ſtrives to palliate, are eaſily diſcernible, for he feels himſelf Wounded, and is not able to diſguiſe it. I will betake my ſelf, I ſay, to the preſent Concern with great application and mindfulneſs, fully making good my *Former Charges* againſt his Book, and clearing my own from thoſe ſorry Objections and Cavils which he hath ſince rais'd againſt it. In the whole management I will ſincerely acquaint the Reader firſt with *his own words*, and then offer my Refutation of them: and all along I will

* *Miſhn. Tract. Avoth.* c. 5.

be careful to baniſh all Indecent Reflections; unleſs thoſe ſhall be counted ſuch which are purely grounded on his own expreſſions, and which his Freedom of Language neceſſarily and unavoidably adminiſters to me.

The Main *Charges* are theſe. 1. That he unwarrantably crowded all the Neceſſary Articles of Faith into *One*, with a deſign of favouring *Socinianiſm*. 2. That he ſhew'd his good will to this Cauſe by interpreting thoſe Texts which reſpect the *Holy Trinity*, after the Antitrinitarian mode. 3. That he gave proof of his being *Socinianiz'd* by his utter ſilence about *Chriſt's ſatisfying for us*, and purchaſing Salvation by vertue of his Death, when he deſignedly undertook to enumerate the *Advantages* and *Benefits* which accrue to mankind by Chriſt's coming into the World. And in the making good of theſe Particular Charges, I ſhall (as I did before) evidence to the World that this Writer hath not only a deſign to cheriſh *Socinianiſm*, but at the ſame time to make way for *Atheiſm*.

I begin with the Firſt, on which I will enlarge more than on any of the reſt; becauſe it comprehends in it ſeveral

veral other Particulars, and becauſe in diſcuſſing of this, I ſhall have opportunity to lay open the Sophiſtry and Diſſimulation of this *Vindicator*, and likewiſe to diſcover to the Reader how Miſchievous and Pernicious his Deſign is. Firſt, it is obſervable that this Guilty Man would be ſhifting off the Enditement by excepting againſt the *formality of the Words*, as if ſuch were not to be found in his Book. But when doth he do this? In the cloſe of it, when his matter was exhauſted, and he had nothing elſe to ſay, *Vindic.* p. 38. Then he bethinks himſelf of this Salvo, whereas he had generally before pleaded to the formal Enditement, and had thereby owned it to be True. And indeed he can do no other, for it was the main work he ſet himſelf about to find but *One Article* of Faith in all the Chapters of the four *Goſpels* and the *Acts of the Apoſtles*: and accordingly he over and over again declares, that there is but that One Truth (viz. *Jeſus is the Meſſiah*) *neceſſarily to be aſſented to by Chriſtians*, or (as he ſometimes words it) *abſolutely required to make a man a Chriſtian, or a member of Chriſt. This is the* SOLE *Doctrin preſs'd and requir'd to be believ'd*

in the whole tenour of our Saviour's and his Apoſtles preaching. p. 192. of his *Reaſonableneſs of Chriſtianity.* And again in the ſame place. *This was the* ONLY *Goſpel Article of Faith which was Preached to them.* This he often inculcates, having left out ſeveral conſiderable paſſages in the very *Goſpels*, and having thrown aſide the *Epiſtles*, as if they were no part of the New Teſtament, hoping that ſome of his Readers would be bubbled by this means.

And when I told him of his *One Article*, he knew well enough that I did not exclude the Article of the *Deity*, for that is a Principle of *Natural Religion*; whereas, I only took notice of his paſſing by and wholly omitting thoſe points which are *Evangelical.* Yet he willfully miſtakes me in this, p. 27. of his *Vindication*, and ſaith he doth not deny the neceſſary belief of a *Deity*, or *One only True God*; and ſo the belief of the *Meſſias* with that makes Two Articles. Thus he would perſwade the Reader, that I miſunderſtood him, and that I tax'd him with ſetting up One Article, when he acknowledges two. But the Reader ſees his Shuffling; for my Diſcourſe did not treat (neither doth his

Book

Book run that way) of Principles of *Natural Religion*, but of the *Revealed one*, and Particularly the *Christian*. Accordingly this was it which I taxed him with, that of all the Principles and Articles of Christianity he chose out but *One* as necessarily to be believed to make a Man a Christian.

And though since he hath tried to split this One into two, p. 28. yet he labours in vain, for *to believe Jesus to be the Messias* amounts to the same, with *believing him to be a King or Ruler*, his being *Anointed* (*i. e.* being the *Messias*) including that in it. Yet he hath the Vanity to add in great Characters, THESE ARE ARTICLES, as if the putting them into these *Great Letters* would make one Article two. Such is the fond fancy and conceitedness of the Gentleman, whereas in other places he hath formally declared, that there is but *One Article* that is the necessary Matter of Faith. This I had just reason to except against; and now I will give a farther account of my doing so, by shewing that, besides that One Fundamental Principle or Article which he so often mentions, there are *Others* that are as necessarily to be believed to make a

Man a *Christian*, yea to give him the denomination of a *Believer*, in the sense of the Gospel. Several of these I particularly, but barely enumerated in my former *Discourse*, and now I will distinctly insist on the most of them, and let the Reader see, that it is as necessary for a Convert to Christianity to give assent to *them*, as to that other he so frequently specifies.

This Proposition, that *by one man sin entred into the World, and death by sin:* and this which follows, *Death passed upon all men, for as much as all men have sinned*, Rom. 5. 12. and that other, that even *the Regenerate* (for the Apostle speaks of himself and the Converted Ephesians) *are by nature the Children of wrath, as well as others*, Eph. 2. 3. these, I say, are as absolutely necessary to be known, assented to, and believed, in order to our being *Christians* as this Proposition, *Jesus is the Messias, or Sent of God*. For I ask, what was the end of his being sent? Was it not to Help Mankind, to rescue and deliver them from some Evil? And where can we be inform'd concerning the Rise and Nature of this Evil, but in the Sacred and Inspired Writings? And do not these fore-

foreſaid Texts, which we find in St. *Paul's Epiſtles*, acquaint us with the true Source and Quality of our condition by nature? Do they not diſcover the Root of Mans Miſery, *viz.* the Apoſtacy of *Adam* (for he is that *one Man*) and the dreadful Conſequences of it, expreſſed by *Death* and *Wrath*? And is this ſet down to no purpoſe in theſe Inſpired *Epiſtles*? Is it not requiſite that we ſhould know it and believe it? Yea, is not this abſolutely requiſite? For it is impoſſible any one ſhould firmly imbrace, or ſo much as ſeriouſly attend to the Doctrin of the *Meſſias*, unleſs he be perſuaded that *He ſtands in need of him*. And can he be perſuaded of this unleſs he be acquainted with his Degenerate and Miſerable State, his univerſal Depravity and innate Proneſs to what is Vitious, and with the true Original of it? *viz.* The voluntary Defection and Fall of our Firſt Parents, and with that the loſs of our Happineſs. The word *Meſſias* is an inſignificant term till we have a belief of this: Why then is there a Treatiſe publiſhed to tell the World, that the bare belief of a *Meſſias* is all that is required of a Chriſtian?

Again,

Again, it is not only neceſſary to know that *Jeſus is the Meſſias*, but alſo to know and believe *who* this *Jeſus*, this *Meſſias* is, *viz.* whether he be *God* or *Man*, or both. For every one will grant that there is a Vaſt Difference between the one and the other, as much as there is betwixt Infinite and Finite; and therefore that we may have a due apprehenſion concerning the *Meſſias*, it is abſolutely neceſſary, that we ſhould believe him to be what he is declared to be in the Infallible Writings, *viz.* *God* as well as *Man*. *The Word was God*, John 1. 1. *The Word was made Fleſh*, v. 14. And this *Word* is *the Only begotten of the Father*, in the ſame Verſe. *God was manifeſt in the Fleſh*, 1 Tim. 3. 16. He is called not only *God* in theſe places, and in ſeveral others, but he is ſtil'd *the True God*, 1 John 5. 20. and *the Great God*, Tit. 2. 13. *The Lord of all*, Acts 10. 36. *God bleſſed for ever*, Rom. 9. 5. Hence we muſt conclude, that there is a neceſſity of believing the *Meſſias* to be *the very God*, of the ſame Eſſence with the Father and the Holy Ghoſt, for theſe are the two other *Perſons* included in the Deity. So that hence it will follow, that it is requiſite to believe the Holy *Trinity*,

nity, i. e. that there are in the Godhead Three Perſons, Father, Son and Holy Ghoſt; which is the Doctrin that our Saviour himſelf taught (and he taught it, that it might be *believed*) *Mat.* 28. 19. where the Celebration of *Baptiſm*, which is a ſolemn part of Divine Worſhip, is commanded to be *in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghoſt*, who are *One God*, 1 John 5. 7. *Theſe Three are One*, one Eſſence or Being, as the word ἕν imports. Thoſe words of the Apoſtle are obſervable, 1 *Cor.* 1. 13. *Were ye baptiſed in the name of Paul?* As much as to ſay, *Baptiſm* is in the name of *God*, and not of a Man: Therefore when it is ſaid, *Go and Baptize in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt*, it is included, that theſe Three are *God*, *i. e.* Three Perſons of one and the ſame Deity. Thus it is manifeſt, that the believing of *Jeſus*'s being the *Meſſias*, or *Anointed* is not ſufficient to make a Man a Chriſtian Believer, but he muſt further believe theſe Propoſitions or Articles, *viz.* that the Son of God was made fleſh, *i. e.* aſſumed our Human Nature; that Chriſt is True God; that He with the Father and the Spirit are One God; for theſe

are

are not only expreſſed in the *Goſpels* and *Epiſtles* (out of both which we are to gather the Fundamental Articles of Faith) and conſequently are to be aſſented to by all Chriſtians, but the very Nature of the thing it ſelf dictates that we ought to have a firm belief of theſe Truths; for otherwiſe when a Man profeſſes his belief in the *Meſſias*, he is yet ignorant of the *Perſon* he pretends to believe in. He doth not know whether he believes in a *God* or in a *Man*, or to which of theſe he is beholding, for the Good he looks for by the Meſſias's coming. Now, Sir, you with your *Reaſonableneſs of Chriſtianity*, what do you think of this? Is it not reaſonable that a Chriſtian ſhould (as the Apoſtle ſpeaks of himſelf) *know whom he hath believed?* 2 Tim. 1. 12. Nay, is it not indiſpenſably neceſſary, that he ſhould know whether it be a *Divine*, or *Human*, or *Angelical* Power that he is obliged to, that ſo he may accordingly proportion his Affections and Service? for (what ever the late Set of Socinians hold) there muſt be a *difference* made between the Homage which is paid to a Creature (ſuch as they declare Chriſt to be) and that which is due only to the Creator.

I will

I will refer the Reader to the Incomparable Biſhop *Pearſon* on the Second Article of the *Creed*, where he ſhews, the "*Neceſſity of our believing Chriſt to be the* "*Eternal Son of God, and God himſelf*, "1. For the directing and confirming of "our Faith concerning the *Redemption* of "Mankind. 2. For the right informing "of us about that *Worſhip* and *Honour* "which are due to him. 3. For giving us "a right apprehenſion, and conſequent-"ly a due value of the *Infinite Love* of "God the Father in ſending his Only-be-"gotten Son into the World to die for "us. Thus this Judicious Writer. But our Nameleſs Author would perſuade us, that there is no neceſſity of believing any ſuch thing.

Then in the next place, we are to have a right conception concerning our *Recovery* and *Reſtauration* by this *Meſſias*, who is God-Man. And here thoſe ſeveral Scriptures will furniſh us with Articles, *As by the offence of one, judgment came upon all men to condemnation, even ſo by the righteouſneſs of one the free gift came upon all men unto juſtification of life. For as by one mans diſobedience many were made ſinners, ſo by the obedience of one ſhall many be made righteous*, Rom. 5. 18, 19.

He

He appeared to put away ſin by the ſacrifice of himſelf, Heb. 9. 26. *Chriſt was once offered to bear the ſins of many*, Heb. 9.28. *Chriſt hath once ſuffered for ſins, the juſt for the unjuſt*, 1 Pet. 3. 18. *He gave himſelf a Ranſom for all men*, 1 Tim. 2.6. *Ye are redeemed with the precious blood of Chriſt*, 1 Pet. 1. 18, 19. And to it is prefix'd *ye know*, to let us underſtand that this Article is to be known and aſſented to. *We are bought with a price*, 1 Cor. 6. 20. and 7. 23. *We are reconciled unto God by the death of his Son*, Rom. 5. 10. *By him now we have received the Atonement*, v. 11. *By one offering he hath perfected for ever them that are ſanctified*, Heb. 10. 14. *It behoved Chriſt to ſuffer, and to riſe from the dead the third day*, Luk. 24. 46. *Chriſt muſt needs have ſuffered, and riſen again from the dead*, Acts 17. 3. *He was taken up into heaven, and ſat on the right hand of God*, Mark 16. 19. Theſe and the like places afford us ſuch Fundamental and Neceſſary Doctrins as theſe are, that by and for the Meritorious Righteouſneſs and Obedience of Chriſt (the Second *Adam*) we are accounted Righteous and Obedient in the ſight of God: That Chriſt was a Sacrifice for us, and ſuffered in our ſtead:

ſtead: That he ſatisfied Divine Juſtice by paying an Infinite Price for us; That by vertue of that Payment all the Debts, *i. e.* all the Sins of Believers are perfectly abſolved: That hereby the anger of the Incenſed Deity is pacified, and that we are entirely Reconciled to him: That we have an aſſurance of all this by Chriſt's riſing from the dead, and aſcending triumphantly into Heaven. Theſe are *Principles of the Oracles of God*, Heb. 5. 12. Theſe are part of the *Form of ſound words*, 2 Tim. 1. 13. which are indiſpenſable Ingredients in the *Chriſtian Faith*, which you may know by this, that if a man be obliged to the belief of the Meſſias's Coming, it is undeniably requiſite that he ſhould know *what* the Meſſias came to do for him, and that he ſhould firmly yield aſſent to it. This I think no Man of Reaſon will deny: and then it will follow that theſe Articles which I have laſt mentioned are the Neceſſary and Unexceptionable object or matter of the Faith of a Chriſtian Man. And here likewiſe it were eaſie to ſhew, that *Adoption*, *Juſtification*, *Pardon of Sins*, &c. which are Privileges and Benefits beſtowed upon us by the *Meſſias*, are neceſſary matters of our

our Belief, for we can't duly acknowledge him for our Benefactor and Saviour, unleſs we believe, that theſe Great Prerogatives are confer'd upon us.

Moreover, it is of undoubted neceſſity in order to our being *Chriſtians*, that we know and believe what the *Meſſias requires of us*; which is contained in ſuch general Texts as theſe, *That ye being delivered out of the hands of your enemies may ſerve him* (Chriſt our Deliverer) *without fear, in holineſs and righteouſneſs before him all the days of our life*, Luke 1. 75. *The grace of God which bringeth ſalvation, teacheth us, to deny ungodlineſs and worldly luſts*, &c. Tit. 2. 11, 12. *He gave himſelf for us, that he might redeem us from all iniquity*, &c. Tit. 2. 14. *This is the will of God, even your ſanctification*, 1 Theſſ. 4. 3. *Without Faith it is impoſſible to pleaſe God*, Heb. 11. 6. *Without holineſs no man ſhall ſee the Lord*, Heb. 12. 14. Which places yield us ſuch Propoſitions as theſe, that the *Meſſias* who vouchſafed to come into the World to redeem loſt Man, requires of him univerſal Holineſs and Righteouſneſs, and the abandoning of all ſin and ungodlineſs: That it was one grand end and deſign of Chriſt's viſiting the World

would to redeem men from their iniquities, to ſanctifie their Natures, and to make them entirely godly, ſober and righteous in their Lives: That without theſe there is no Salvation, no Seeing of God in the regions of Glory, no hopes of Everlaſting Happineſs. The diſbelieving of theſe *Articles* hath made ſo many Sorry *Chriſtians* as we ſee every where, ſuch as lay claim to that Honourable *Title*, but are regardleſs of that Holineſs which ſhould accompany it. We muſt not only believe that *Jeſus is the Meſſias*, but we muſt believe this alſo that we can have no Benefit by this Meſſias unleſs we by Faith and Obedience adhere to him.

Neither is this enough, it is further matter of our Belief, as we are *Chriſtians*, that our Salvation ſprings from the mere Favour and Bounty of God through his Son *Jeſus Chriſt*, and that this is the only ſource of that Happineſs which we expect. *By grace we are ſaved, through faith, and that not of our ſelves: it is the gift of God, Eph.* 2. 8. *Not by works of righteouſneſs which we have done, but according to his Mercy he ſaveth us, Tit.* 3. 5. Where there is not this perſwaſion and belief, the true notion of *Chriſtianity* va-

nishes, and the conceit of *Merit* comes in its room: Wherefore there is a Necessity that we believe and be perswaded aright as to this matter. We are Worthless Creatures of our selves, but there is a Worthiness derived to us from the Unspotted and Meritorious Righteousness of him that is the Eternal Son of God. He that knows not this, he that believes not this deserves not the Name of a *Christian*. I should have been glad to have found something of this nature in this *Gentleman's Christianity*. But he endeavours to seduce his Readers by other apprehensions, he tells them that the bare assenting to this, that *Jesus is the Messias*, is the Summ Total of the Christian Faith, and the Gospel requires no more.

Lastly, The doctrines of the *Resurrection* of the *Final Judgment*, and of *Eternal Glory in heaven* are contained in such passages of the New Testament as these, *Christ will raise up his at the last day*, *John* 6. 44. *The Lord Jesus Christ shall judge the quick and the dead at his appearing*, 2 *Tim.* 4. 1. *Father, I will that they whom thou hast given me, be with me where I am, that they may behold my glory*, *John* 17. 24. And are not these

Truths

Truths the proper Object of our *Faith* now under the Gospel, they so peculiarly belonging to the doctrine and belief of the *Messias*? Can we believe in him, and yet not believe these Great things which are brought to light by his preaching the Gospel? For though they were in some measure discovered and revealed before (*i. e.* the General Doctrine concerning a Future State, and the Endless Happiness accompanying it was not unknown) yet *Christ*'s Words and those of the *Apostles* do more abundantly assure us of the truth of them: especially Christ's Rising from the dead and ascending into Glory have irrefragably confirmed the reality of them, according to that of St. *Peter*, *We are begotten again unto a lively hope by the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead, to an Inheritance incorruptible and undefiled, and that fadeth not away, reserved in heaven for us*, 1 *Pet.* 1. 4. Who but the *Vindicator* could imagine that these Evangelical Doctrines are *not Necessary Matter of Faith* to Christian Men? Who but he could fancy and (which is more) publickly assert that the belief of the *Messias*'s being sent from God, without being acquainted with his gracious ap-

pointment as to our *Future Rewards*, is all that is required as neceſſary to conſtitute a *Chriſtian Believer?* Eſpecially, when it is ſaid, *He that comes unto God muſt believe that he is a Rewarder*, Heb. 11. 6. Obſerve it, *he muſt believe*: then it is not indifferent, but a *Neceſſary* Article of faith.

CHAP.

CHAP. II.

The foreſaid Articles and Doctrines are proved to be Neceſſary *matter of Chriſtian Faith. Not that a man is ſuppoſed* Actually *to exert his Aſſent and Belief every moment. That we may be True Chriſtians,* All *theſe Fundamental Truths muſt be imbraced, and none excluded. The late Writer's* forgetfulneſs. *It is prov'd that he grounds his notion of* One Article *upon the Weakneſs of Underſtanding and Capacity in the Generality of people. Herein he follows the Steps of the* Racovians, *who ſubmit the greateſt Myſteries to the judgment of the Vulgar; and, if they will not bear that Teſt, reject them. The Doctrine of the* Trinity *how ſaid to have no* Difficulty *in it. It contains in it no* Contradiction. *This Propoſition,* Jeſus is the Meſſias *is not more intelligible than any of the Articles before mentioned.*

THUS I have briefly ſet before the Reader thoſe *Evangelical Truths*, thoſe *Chriſtian Principles* which belong to the very Eſſence of Chriſtianity. I have proved them to be ſuch, and I have

have reduced moſt of them to certain *Propoſitions*, which is a thing the *Vindicator* call'd for, *p.* 16. If what I have ſaid will not content him, I am ſure I can do nothing that will. And therefore, if he ſhould capriciouſly require any thing more, it would be as great Folly in me to comply with it as it is in him to move it. From what I have ſaid it is evident that he is groſly miſtaken when he ſaith, *Whatever doctrines the Apoſtles required to be believed to make a man a Chriſtian, are to be found in thoſe places of Scripture which he hath quoted in his book, p.* 11. The places which he quotes are made uſe of by him to ſhew that there is but *One Article* of Belief, *viz.* that *Chriſt is the Meſſiah:* but I think I have ſufficiently proved that there are Other Doctrines beſides That which are requir'd to be believed to make a man a Chriſtian. Why did the Apoſtles *write* theſe Doctrines? Was it not that thoſe they writ to might give their *Aſſent* to them? Nay, did they not require Aſſent to them? Yes verily, for this is to be proved from the Nature of the things contained in thoſe Doctrines, which were ſuch as had *immediate* reſpect to the Occaſion, Author, Way, Means, and

and Iſſue of their Redemption and Salvation, as any impartial judg by examining the ſeveral Particular Articles and Propoſitions will readily grant. So that the ſum of all amounts to this, The belief of thoſe things without the knowledg of which a man cannot be ſaved is abſolutely Neceſſary: but the belief of the foregoing Particulars is the belief of ſuch things without the knowledg of which a man cannot be ſaved; Therefore the belief of theſe Particulars is abſolutely neceſſary. None will be ſo refractory, I ſuppoſe, as to deny the firſt Propoſition in this Syllogiſm; therefore I am to prove the Second, which is eaſily effected thus. The belief of thoſe things which have *Immediate* reſpect to the Occaſion, Author, Way, Means, and Iſſue of our Salvation, and which are neceſſary for knowing the True Nature and Deſign of it, is the belief of ſuch things without the knowledg of which a man cannot be ſaved: but ſuch is the belief of the preceding Articles, *Ergo*.

Not without good reaſon therefore I call'd them the *Eſſential* and *Integral* Parts of our Chriſtian and Evangelical Faith: And why the *Vindicator* ſneers at theſe Terms (*p.*18.) I know no reaſon

but this that he can't confute the application of them. Surely none but this Upſtart *Racovian* will have the confidence to deny that Theſe Articles of Faith are ſuch as are Neceſſary to conſtitute a *Chriſtian*, as to the intellectual and doctrinal part of Chriſtianity; ſuch as muſt in ſome meaſure be known and aſſented to by him, ſuch as muſt be generally receiv'd and imbrac'd by him. Not that a man is ſuppoſed every moment to *Actually* exert his Aſſent and Belief, for none of the Moral Vertues, none of the Evangelical Graces are exerted thus always. Wherefore, that Queſtion, *p.* 16. (though he ſaith *he asks it ſeriouſly*) might have been ſpared, *Whether every one of theſe Fundamentals is required to be believed to make a Man a Chriſtian, and ſuch as without the Actual belief thereof, he cannot be ſaved?* Here is *Seriouſneſs* pretended when there is none, for the deſign is only to Cavil, and (if he can) to expoſe my Aſſertion. But he is not able to do it, for all his Critical Demands are anſwered in theſe few words, *viz.* that the Intellectual (as well as the Moral) Endowments are never ſuppoſed to be Always in Act: they are exerted upon Occaſion, and not

not all of them at a time. And therefore he miſtakes if he thinks, or rather as he objects without thinking, that theſe Doctrines, if they be Fundamental and Neceſſary, muſt be *always actually* believed. No man beſides himſelf ever ſtarted ſuch a thing. And why ſhould not *every one* of theſe Evangelical Truths (which is another thing he puts into his Queſtion) be believed and imbraced? They are in our Bibles for that very purpoſe, as I have proved, and therefore I need not undertake it again here. Hence it follows that a man cannot be a *Chriſtian* without the knowledg and belief of theſe Truths which are the *baſis* of Religion, the Standard of the Chriſtian Faith, the very Badges and Characters of Chriſtianity. Wherefore for any man to make up Chriſtianity without the belief of theſe is a Ridiculous and abſurd attempt, and conſequently we may gueſs that none would have ventured upon it but this Writer. This is he that ſets up One Article *with defiance of the reſt*, (though he is much diſpleaſed with me for ſaying ſo, *p.* 31.) for what is excluding them wholly but *defying* them? Wherefore, ſeeing he utterly excludes all the reſt by re-

representing them as *Useless to the making a man a Christian* (which is the design of his whole Undertaking) it is manifest that he *defies* them.

But let us hear what this Author pleads for himself. He founds his conceit of *One Article* partly upon this, that a Multitude of doctrines is obscure, and hard to be understood, and therefore he trusses all up in One Article, that the *poor people* and *bulk of mankind* may bear it. This is the Scope of a great part of his book. But his Memory doth not keep pace with his Invention, and thence he saith *he remembers nothing of this in his book. Vind.p.27.* This Worthy Writer doth not know his own Reasoning that he uses, as particularly thus, that he troubles Christian men with no more but *One Article*, because that is *Intelligible*, and all people high and low may comprehend it. For he hath chosen out (he thinks) a Plain and Easie Article, whereas the others which are commonly propounded are not generally agreed upon (he saith) and are dubious and uncertain. But the believing that *Jesus was the Messias* hath nothing of doubtfulness or obscurity in it. This the Reader will find to be the drift and design

design of several of his Pages. And the reason why I did not quote any single one of them was because he insists on this so long together, and spins it out after his way. In *p.* 301. of his *Reasonableness of Christianity*, where he sets down the *short, plain, easie and intelligible Summary* (as he calls it) of Religion, couch'd in a Single Article, he immediately adds, *The All-merciful God seems herein to have consulted the poor of this world, and the bulk of mankind. These are Articles* (whereas he had set down but *One*) *that the labouring and illiterate man may comprehend.* He assigns this as a ground why it was God's pleasure there should be but One Point of Faith, because hereby Religion may be understood the better, the generality of people may comprehend it. This he represents as a Great Kindness done by God to men, whereas a Variety of Articles would be hard to be understood. This he enlarges upon, and flourishes it over after his fashion, and yet *he desires to know when he said so, p.* 29. *Vindic.*

Good Sir, let me be permitted to acquaint you that your Memory is as defective as your Judgment; for in the very *Vindication* you attribute it to *the goodness*

ness and condescention of the Almighty that he requires nothing as absolutely necessary to be believed but what is suited to Vulgar capacities and the comprehensions of illiterate men, p. 30. It is clear then that you found your *One Article* on this, that it is suited to *Vulgar capacities*, whereas the Other Articles mentioned by me are obscure and ambiguous, and therefore surpass the comprehension of the Illiterate. And yet you pretend that you have forgot that any such thing was said by you: which shews that you are Careless of your Words, and that you forget what you write. What shall we say to such an Oblivious Author as this? He takes no notice of what falls from his own pen, and therefore within a page or two he confutes himself, and gives himself the Lye.

The plain truth is, he *Socinianizes* here, but will not own it, which makes him run into these Contradictions. He follows the steps of his Good Patron *Crellius* (one of the stiffest *Racovians* that we have) who throws aside several Articles of faith because they are Dark and Difficult, and not adapted to the Capacity of the Vulgar. This very thing he alledges to set off his Arguments against the

the Holy *Trinity*, *viz.* that * the doctrine which he maintains is *according to the underſtanding of the Vulgar. The Common people* (he ſaith) *among the Jews, the Fiſhermen did not apprehend the doctrine of Three Perſons in the Deity: neither do the Vulgar Chriſtians at this day form any ſuch notion*: therefore away with the doctrine of the *Trinity*. And this is the guiſe and practice of our *Socinians* at this day: it is known that they are wont to propound this Sacred Point to the very School-boys (very great Judges indeed) and to demand their Reſolution of it, and they pretend that they give it in the Negative. All the appeal now is to *Vulgar Capacities*, to the judgment of the *Multitude*. If theſe pleaſe to allow of any more Articles of Belief than One, then our Author will conſent to it that we ſhall have them: but he acquaints us that *they* are for no more but *One*, and therefore we muſt be content with That. This is his New *Divinity*. And a † *Socinian* Brother, who undertakes the defence of his Notions, ſeconds him in this, telling us that *the*

---

* *De Uno Deo Patre. lib.* 1. † The Exceptions of Mr. *E. &c.* examined.

the Articles of faith which are generally propounded by Divines are difficult, obscure, unintelligible, abstruse, but the One Article of Mr. Lock) *is not so,* but is exactly calculated for the Vulgar Meridian, and therefore is the only Authentick and Necessary Point in the Christian Theology.

I think the Reader will bear me witness that I have refuted this wild Conceit by giving a distinct account of the Evangelical Doctrines and Articles before mentioned, and at the same time shewing how Intelligible and Plain they are, and by letting him see the Absolute Necessity of their being assented to and embraced by every Christian. No true Lover of God and Truth need *doubt* of any of them, for there is no Ambiguity and Doubtfulness in them. They shine with their own light, and to an unprejudiced eye are plain, evident and illustrious. And they would always continue so if some Ill-minded men did not perplex and entangle them, on purpose to render them contemptible, yea, to exclude them wholly from being the matter of our belief. And as to the doctrine of the *Trinity*, which is the Main Verity which these men set themselves against,

againſt, there is not any Difficulty, much leſs any Abſurdity or Contradiction (as they are wont to cry out) in that Article of our Chriſtian Belief. Indeed there is a *Difficulty* in this and ſeveral Other Truths of the Goſpel as to the *Exact Manner* of the things themſelves, which we ſhall never be able to comprehend, at leaſt not on this ſide of Heaven: but there is *no Difficulty* as to the Reality and Certainty of them, becauſe we know they are Revealed to us by God in the Holy Scriptures. Nay, as to the thing it ſelf, thus far we can apprehend that it is not impoſſible or abſurd that the Three Diſtinct Perſons in the Deity ſhould be One God, for there may be a Plurality of Perſons in the ſame Infinite Eſſence. Every Perſon doth not require a Single Particular Eſſence, or if they will call the Three Numerical Subſiſtencies by the name of *Eſſences*, yet they are united in One General *Subſtance* or *Eſſence*, which is common to them all. And when they ſay it is a *Contradiction* that One ſhould be Three, which is as much as to ſay, One is not One, this is ſoon taken off by replying (and that moſt truly) that *One and not One* in the *ſame reſpect* is a Contradiction, but *One and*

not

not One in *different respects* is no Contradiction. Any smatterer in Logick knows this. And this is the case here, for tho the Three Personalities be distinguish'd, and that really, yet they agree in One Common Essence, and so the Divinity is both *One* and *Three* in different respects, on different considerations. And this is that which is abundantly testified in Scripture, in the *Gospels* as well as the *Epistles* (let our Author remember that:) there we learn that the Divine Essence or Nature is branch'd out into Three Distinct Persons,* *Father*, *Son* and *Holy Ghost*, and that * *these Three are One.*

Then as to the Proposition which this New Modeller of Christianity commends to the World as the only Necessary Matter of Faith, although he pretends it is more Intelligible than any of those that I have named, yet any Judicious Man cannot but see the contrary, for this must be explain'd (as well as those) before his *Vulgar Capacities* can apprehend it. Here first the name *Jesus*, which is of Hebrew Extraction, though since Greciz'd, must be expounded, and so must the Word *Messias* (as I said before:)

* *Mat.* 28. 19. *John* 10. 30.

fore:) And when this is done they must be told, even according to the confession of a late * Socinian Writer (whom afterwards I must discourse with a little) *the manner of his being the Messiah, such as being conceived by the Holy Ghost and Power of the most High, his being anointed with the Holy Ghost, his being raised from the dead, and exalted to be a Prince and a Saviour.* And then they must be told for what End and Purpose this was (or else they can have no true belief of the *Messias*) under which several Weighty Truths are comprehended. And if he doth not agree to this, *viz.* that the Words must be thus *Opened* and *Explained*, and fully understood so that Christian Souls may have the true sense of them, then he doth as good as say that the bare pronouncing of these Words *Jesus is the Messias* is enough to make a Christian. And we shall be apt to think that he intends this for a *Charm* or *Spell*, and that the very Syllables will suffice to make one a True Believer, especially if he be one of the *Vulgar* and *Illiterate*. But it may be he hath something else to say to an *Other* Rank of Men: Perhaps

* The Exceptions, &c. examined.

he holds that there is one Chriſtianity for the *bulk of mankind*, and another for the Finer and Better Sort of People: And then it is likely he will tell us of two Heavens, one very Spacious to hold the *Multitude*, and the other of a Leſſer Compaſs to receive the reſt. Theſe are the Abſurdities (which I confeſs I delight not in expoſing or ſo much as mentioning) that this New Notion may produce. Whence it appears that all his jargon and chatter about his *One Article* are vain and inſignificant, and are ſerviceable only to gull the Unwary Reader, and (which is worſe) to debauch Chriſtianity it ſelf.

CHAP.

CHAP. III.

The late Writer's passing by the Epistles, *and not collecting any Articles of Faith out of them shew his* Contempt *of them. His Evasion*, viz. *that the* Epistles were writ to those who were already Believers, *is proved to be groundless. If it were true, it is nothing to his purpose. The* Epistles *teach Fundamentals. His other Evasion*, viz. *that* the Fundamental Articles in the Epistles are mixed without distinction with other Truths *discovered to be of no force, and Retorted upon him. The true Reason why he went no further than the* Gospels *and the* Acts. *His other* Excuses *for rejecting the doctrines contained in the* Epistles *examined, and found to be Sophistical. He travels as far as* China *for* Prudence, *and there borrows it of the* Missionary Jesuites. *The* Rom. 14. 1. *which he alledges, authorizes him not to impose upon* Weak Christians. *His Evasions are inconsistent with themselves, and accordingly not well approved of by the Party. His Objection about the* Apostles Creed *fully answered.* Our Church's *Judgment*

concerning the Articles of this Creed. This Profeſſion of Faith hath ſeveral Articles in it which Socinians *will not ſubſcribe to. Whileſt he is cenſuring, he commits a great* Blunder. *He miſtakes and miſrepreſents the Goſpel-Diſpenſation.*

BUT the Gentleman is not without his *Evaſions*, and he ſees it is high time to make uſe of them. This puts him into ſome diſorder, for when he comes to ſpeak of my mentioning his ill treatment of the *Epiſtles* (which he purpoſely omitted when he made his Collection of Articles, or rather when after all his ſearch he found but One Article) you may obſerve that he begins to grow Warmer than before. Now this Meek Man is nettled, and you may perceive that he is ſenſible of the Scandal that he hath given to good people by his ſlighting of the *Epiſtolary* Writings of the Holy Apoſtles: yet he is ſo cunning as to diſguiſe his Paſſion as well as he can. He *requires me to publiſh to the World thoſe paſſages which ſhew his Contempt of the Epiſtles*, *p.* 19. But what need I, Good Sir, do this, when you have done it your ſelf? I appeal to the Reader whether

ther (after your tedious Collections out of the *Four Evangeliſts*) your paſſing by the *Epiſtles*, and neglecting wholly what the Apoſtles ſay in them be not *publiſhing to the World your Contempt of them.*

But let us hear why he did not attempt to collect any Articles out of theſe Writings: he aſſigns this as One Reaſon, *The Epiſtles being writ to thoſe who were already Believers, it could not be ſuppoſed that they were writ to them to teach them Fundamentals, p.* 13, 14. *Vindic.* Certainly no man could have conjectured that he would have uſed ſuch an Evaſion as this. I will ſay that for him, he goes beyond all Surmiſes, he is above all Conjectures: he hath a faculty of Shifting which no creature on Earth can ever fathom. Do we not know that the *Four Goſpels* were Writ to and for *Believers* as well as *Unbelievers?* Are we not particularly and expreſly told by St. *Luke* that *he writ his Goſpel to the moſt Excellent Theophilus? Luk.* 1. 3. whom all grant to be a *Believing Chriſtian* of ſome eminent rank. Or if this Author be ſo ſingular as to queſtion it, he may be ſatisfied in *v.* 4. by the Evangeliſt himſelf. And ſo the *Acts* of the Apoſtles we find are dedicated to the ſame Eminent

nent Believer, *Acts* 1. 1. By the same Argument then that he would perswade us that the *Fundamentals* are not to be sought for in the *Epistles*, we may prove that they were not to be sought for in the *Gospels*, and in the *Acts*, for even these were writ to those that *believed*. And yet it is clear that this Writer did not make use of this Argument, otherwise he would not have confined the Fundamentals to the *Gospels* and the *Acts*. Here then is want of Sincerity in a great measure, which hath been accounted heretofore a good qualification in a Writer.

Again, granting that the *Epistles* were all of them writ to those that *already believed*, yet what can this be to his purpose? Must no *Believers* have any *Fundamentals* taught them? What is the meaning then of 1 *John* 2. 21. *I have not written unto you because you know not the Truth, but because you know it.* Suppose they have *forgot* the Fundamentals, or have *corrupted* and perverted them? as was the case of the *Galatians*, who mixed the Law with the Gospel, Legal Works with Faith; and of the Dispersed *Hebrews* who had received the Christian Doctrine, but were falling away from

from it. Might not the Apoſtle, yea did he not in his *Epiſtles* to theſe Perſons remind them of the *Great Articles of the Chriſtian Faith?* Did he not, when he writ to the *Galatians* aſſert the doctrine of Juſtification through faith in Chriſt's Righteouſneſs, without the Works of the Law? Did he not in his Epiſtle to the Wavering *Hebrews* endeavour to eſtabliſh them in Chriſtianity by diſplaying the Excellency and Tranſcendency of the *Prieſthood* of Chriſt, by convincing them of the Efficacy and Perfection of the *One Sacrifice* of the Meſſias on the Croſs, whereby the ſins of mankind are perfectly Expiated? So *St. John's firſt Epiſtle* was written on occaſion of the Chriſtian Churches (converted from Judaiſm) being endanger'd by certain Seducers that were crept in among them, and labour'd to unſettle their belief concerning the *Divinity* as well as the Humanity of our Saviour. Whereupon this Apoſtle, who had clearly delivered the doctrine of the *Holy Trinity* in the beginning of his *Goſpel*, now more eſpecially urges that Principal Article of their Faith the *Deity* of Chriſt, *chap.* 2. *v.* 22, 23. and alſo in expreſs words aſſerts the *Whole Trinity*, *chap.* 5. *v.* 7. Thus it is manifeſt that

the Apoſtles in their *Epiſtles* taught *Fundamentals*, which is contrary to what this Gentleman ſaith, that ſuch a thing *could not be ſuppoſed*: and he would pretend That as a reaſon why he did not look for any Neceſſary Articles of Faith in the *Epiſtles*. But we ſee how groundleſs his pretence is.

Hear another feigned ground of his omitting the *Epiſtles*, viz. *becauſe the Fundamental Articles are here promiſcuouſly, and without diſtinction mix'd with other Truth.* p. 14. But who ſees not that this is a mere Eluſion? for on the ſame account he might have forborn to ſearch for Fundamental Articles in the *Goſpels*, for they do not lie there together, but are diſperſed up and down: the Doctrinal and Hiſtorical part are mix'd with one another: but he pretends to ſever them; why then did he not make a ſeparation between the Doctrines in the *Epiſtles* and thoſe Other Matters that are treated of there? He hath nothing to reply to this, and therefore we muſt again look upon what he hath ſuggeſted as a caſt of his Shuffling faculty. Or if he ſhould excuſe himſelf by ſaying that Neceſſary and Fundamental Principles can't be diſtinguiſh'd from

thoſe

thoſe other Truths which occur in the Epiſtolary Writings, any one may diſcover the inſufficiency of ſuch a plea, becauſe Neceſſary Truths may be diſtinguiſh'd from thoſe that are not ſuch by the Nature and High Importance of them, by their Immediate reſpect to the Author and Means of our Salvation.

Beſides, I ſuppoſe this Flouriſhing *Scribler* (he knows very well why I give him that particular Title) will not deny that the *Epiſtles* contain divers Rules of Holy Living, ſeveral Religious Precepts in order to the practiſe of Godlineſs; and that theſe are not ſo *promiſcuouſly and without diſtinction mixt with other Truths* but that they may eaſily be diſtinguiſh'd from them. Why then may we not expect to find *Neceſſary Doctrines of Faith* in theſe Writings as well as Inſtructions concerning the practiſe of Holineſs, and the regulating of our Lives? And why may we not diſtinguiſh between theſe and the Occaſional Matters as well as between the Others and them? Nay, it is certain that thoſe Neceſſary doctrines of Faith which were but lightly touch'd upon in the *Goſpels* and the *Acts* are diſtinctly and fully explain'd in theſe *Epiſtles*. The truth then is that the

the Gentleman was loth to go any further than the former: theſe latter affrighted him, for he knew either by reading them or by hear-ſay, that there were ſeveral *Other Divine Truths* in them, which have been generally thought to be Neceſſary to be believ'd in order to making a man a Chriſtian; but our Author had no kindneſs for them. He commands his Readers not to ſtir a jot further than the *Acts*. *It is not in the Epiſtles*, ſaith he, *that we are to learn what are the Fundamental Articles of faith*, p. 295. *They were written for reſolving of doubts and reforming of miſtakes*, (as he ſaith in the ſame place) and therefore I forbid you to ſeek for *Fundamental doctrines* there, you will but loſe your labour, and moreover you will meet in theſe Writings with ſeveral Points which we approve not of, and therefore muſt not admit of, becauſe *Fauſtus Socinus* hath given us a charge to the contrary.

But let us hear further what this *Vindicator* ſaith to excuſe his rejection of the Doctrines contain'd in the *Epiſtles*, and his putting us off with One Article of Faith. *What if the Author* (meaning himſelf) *deſign'd his Treatiſe, as the Title ſhews, chiefly for thoſe who were not yet throughly*

throughly or firmly Chriſtians: purpoſing to work upon thoſe who either wholly disbelievʼd or doubted of the Truth of the Chriſtian Religion? p. 6. Here he comes with his *what ifʼs*, and gives another palpable proof of Counterfeiting, and that in Religion. Now, ſeeing his Book is ſifted, and the deſign of it is laid open, he would make us believe that he intended his Piece for *Atheiſts*, *Turks*, *Jews* and *Pagans*, and a few Weak Chriſtians; for theſe he muſt mean by thoſe that *wholly disbelieve*, and thoſe that are *not firmly Chriſtians*. And he would bring in his *Title* to ſpeak for him, but it ſaith not a word in his behalf; for how thoſe that wholly diſregard and *disbelieve the Scriptures* of the New Teſtament, (as Gentiles, Jews, Mahometans and all Atheiſts do) are like to attend to the *Reaſonableneſs of Chriſtianity as deliverʼd in the Scripture* is not to be conceived, and therefore we look upon all this as mere Sham and Sophiſtry. He is put hard to it, and like one a drowning he faſtens on any thing next at hand. That is his caſe, as any man may perceive. But I ask, Why had we not a hint (one gentle hint at leaſt) of this in all his Book? It would have been very uſeful

to

to the Reader to have been acquainted with his Design. No: he thinks otherwise, for in the same Page he saith, *Would any one blame his Prudence if he mention'd only those Advantages,* (viz. of Christ's Coming) *which all Christians* (especially *Socinian Christians*) *are agreed in?* He hath bethought himself better since he first publish'd his Notions, and (as the result of that) he now begins to resolve what he writ into *Prudence.* I know whence he had this Method (and 'tis likely he hath taken more than this from the same hands) viz. from the Missionary *Jesuites* that went to preach the Gospel to the people of *China.* We are told that they instructed them in some matters relating to our *Saviour*; they let them know that *Jesus* was the *Messias,* the Person promised to be sent into the World, but they conceal'd his *Sufferings* and *Death* and they would not let them know any thing of his *Passion* and *Crucifixion.* So our Author (their humble Imitator) undertakes to instruct the World in Christianity with an omission of its *Principal Articles,* and more especially that of the *Advantage* we have by *Christ's Death,* which was the Prime thing design'd in his Coming into the world.

world. This he calls *Prudence*: ſo that to hide from the people the Main Articles of the Chriſtian Religion, to diſguiſe the Faith of the Goſpel, to betray Chriſtianity it ſelf, is according to this Excellent Writer the Cardinal Vertue of *Prudence*. May we be deliver'd then, ſay I, from a *Prudential Racovian*.

He would clear himſelf by quoting *Rom.* 14. 1. *Him that is weak in the faith receive ye, p.* 7. as if that Text authorized him to deceive Novices and Weak Chriſtians; as if becauſe they are Infirm, therefore he muſt Strengthen them by Impoſing upon them. It may be he will ſay, *Children* muſt have but few Leſſons given them: but I anſwer, there is difference between *few* and *only One*; and there is difference between telling them that there is but One, and afterwards hinting that there are More. For that muſt be the meaning of his *What if he deſign'd his Treatiſe chiefly for thoſe*, &c. What if he firſt of all tells them that nothing is abſolutely requiſite to be believed but this that *Jeſus is the Meſſias*, and what if afterwards he intends to let them know that ſomething elſe is requir'd of them? And yet at the ſame time (ſuch is the unaccountable

humour

humour of the Gentleman) he declares that Nothing more is requir'd of them. Here is no bottom for any thing he ſaith. He contradicts himſelf, and impoſes falſities upon mens minds. He would in one place (I remember) fancifully pleaſe himſelf by thinking that *all his ſins which I eſpie in his book are ſins of Omiſſion, p.* 9. But if this be not one of *Commiſſion* (and that a very Great one) it is hard to tell what is. He pretends a *Deſign of his Book* which was never ſo much as thought of till he was ſollicited by his brethren to vindicate it. But now, (ſee how his *Pious Frauds* proſper) when he hath attempted it, they are diſpleaſed with the way he hath taken. And no wonder, becauſe they cannot but perceive that his *Vindication* is inconſiſtent with his *Treatiſe*, and that by theſe laſt Evaſions and Colluſions he hath in a great meaſure betray'd *their* Cauſe, as well as that of *Chriſtianity*. I find that they have only this to excuſe him that he did not take Time enough to conſider of what he Writ: but for my part, I think that adds to his Fault.

But this Author of the *New Chriſtianity* wiſely objects that the *Apoſtle's Creed* hath none of theſe Articles and Doctrines which

which I mentioned, *p.* 12, 13. Nor doth any conſiderate man wonder at it, for the *Creed* is a Form of outward Profeſſion which is *chiefly* to be made in the Publick Aſſemblies, when Prayers are put up by the Church, and the Holy Scriptures are read. Then this *Abridgment* of Faith is properly uſed, or when there is not generally time or opportunity to make any Enlargement. But we are not to think that it *expreſly* contains in it all the Neceſſary and Weighty Points, all the Important Doctrines of our Belief, it being only deſign'd to be an *Abſtract*. It is with this *Creed* as 'tis with the *Commandments* and the *Lord's Prayer*. If a man *doth* not more than is expreſly enjoyned in the *Decalogue*, he can't be ſaid to *Act* as a Chriſtian. If he *prays* for no more than is expreſly mentioned in the Petitions of the foreſaid *Prayer* he can't be ſaid to *Pray* as a Good Chriſtian. So if a man *believe* no more than is in *expreſs* terms in the *Apoſtle's Creed*, his Faith will not be the *Faith* of a Chriſtian. And yet ſtill it is to be granted that as all things to be *done* and all things to be *prayed for* are *reducible* to the Ten Commandments and the Lord's Prayer, ſo All matters of Faith in ſome manner

manner may be *reduced* to this Brief Platform of Belief. But when I call it an *Abſtract* or *Abbreviature*, it is implied that there are more Truths to be known and aſſented to by a Chriſtian, in order to making him really ſo, than what we meet with here.

And yet I muſt take leave to tell our *Vindicator* that this *Creed* hath more in it than he and his brethren will ſubſcribe to. If he were not above *Catechiſms* as well as *Creeds*, I might remind him of *Our Church*'s judgment concerning the Articles of this *Creed*. *Qu. What doſt thou chiefly learn in theſe Articles of thy Belief? Anſw. Firſt, I learn to believe in God the Father, who had made me and all the world: Secondly, in God the Son, who hath redeemed me and all mankind: Thirdly, in God the Holy Ghoſt, who ſanctifieth me and all the Elect People of God?* Theſe are killing words to a Diſciple of *Socinus*, who acknowledges neither the God-head of the *Son*, nor of the *Holy Ghoſt*, nor the *Redemption* or *Sanctification* by either. Yet our Church, with all the Chriſtian Churches in the world, owns theſe Truths to be contained in the *Apoſtles Creed*. And there are other Articles of this Symbol (let them palliate it as they pleaſe)

pleaſe,) which the *Racovian* Gentlemen are unwilling to give their aſſent to. They faulter about Chriſt's *Judging the quick and the dead*, they partly deny the *Reſurrection of the body*, they deny *Life Everlaſting* as it reſpects wicked men, for they hold that theſe ſhall be Annihilated, of all which I may have occaſion to ſpeak another time. At preſent I only take notice of their lopping off ſeveral Articles from this *Creed*.

But was it not judiciouſly ſaid by this Writer that *it is well for the Compilers of the Creed that they lived not in my days?* p. 12. I tell you, Friend, it was impoſſible they ſhould, for the Learned * *Uſher* and † *Voſſius* and others have proved that that *Symbol* was drawn up not at once, but that ſome Articles of it were adjoyned many years after, far beyond the extent of any man's life; and therefore the Compilers of the Creed could not live in my days, nor could I live in theirs: but I let this paſs as one of the *blunders* of our Thoughtful and Muſing Author. Nor had he reaſon to

* Diatr. de Symbol. † De Trib. Symb.

think that thoſe that made the Apoſtles Creed would have been cenſured by me, for I have vindicated and aſſerted their *Articles*, whereas he and his friends have new-modell'd the *Creed*, yea indeed have preſented us with One Article inſtead of Twelve, and in order to that have ſunk the *Epiſtles*, becauſe they are not *Socinianized, all over Socinianized.*

If this Gentleman had ſaid that the belief of *Jeſus*'s being the *Meſſias* was one of the firſt and leading acts of Chriſtian Faith, he had ſaid right, and none would have oppoſed it. If he had ſaid that the knowledg of the Goſpel, and conſequently of the Doctrines of it, advanc'd at firſt by degrees, and ſhone brighter after our Saviour's Aſcenſion than before, he had ſpoken truth; but when he poſitively and peremptorily declares that neither at firſt nor afterwards there was any Neceſſity of believing more than this that *Jeſus is the Meſſias*, he miſrepreſents the Goſpel-Diſpenſation, and miſtakes the nature of Chriſtianity. To ſtop here, and go no further is unſufferable. This is as if a *Breeder up of Children and Youth* ſhould carry them no

no further than the A B C. He is wholly for *reducing* of Chriſtianity, whereas he ſhould have given it in its Full and Ample Extent; eſpecially he ſhould not have kept back any thing of the *Foundation.*

CHAP. IV.

The Christian Faith *which this Gentleman describes is of the same scantling with that of the* Mahometans. *The Affinity between the* Turks *and* Anti-trinitarians. *The* Devils *are capable of a higher degree of Faith than that which he saith makes a* Christian. *A brief Idea of the* Compleat Faith *of a Christian. The* Danger *of asserting that there is but* One Article *of Christian belief necessary to be assented to. This is the way to introduce* Darkness *and* Blindness *into Christendom, and to promote the designs of that Church which cherishes* Ignorance *as the Mother of Devotion and Religion. How far this Writer is instrumental in it. What care he hath of mens* Souls, *and of their* Salvation. *It is the practise of* Socinian *Writers to curtail Christianity, and to cut off as many Fundamental Articles from it as they can. This Writer had his Platform from* Crellius. *He is approved of and applauded by the* English Socinians. *Three Reasons assign'd why the* Socinians *agree to maim the Heads of Christianity, and to reduce all into One Article. The Office of* Catechizing

techizing *was not instituted for the teaching of* One *Article of Faith only.*

IT is likely I ſhall further exaſperate this Author when I deſire the Reader to obſerve that this *Lank Faith* of his is in a manner no other than the *Faith of a Turk.* For the * Alcoran acknowledges that the *Spirit of God bore witneſs to Chriſt the Son of* Mary: *a Divine Soul was put into him. He was the Meſſenger of the Spirit, and the Word of God.* And in another place *God* is brought in declaring that *he had ſent Chriſt the Son of* Mary, &c. And in other places he is mention'd as a *Prophet*, as a *Great Man*, one Commiſſion'd by God, and *ſent by him* into the world. This is of the like import with what our good *Ottoman* Writer the *Vindicator* ſaith of our Saviour, and this he holds is the ſum of all that is Neceſſary to be believ'd concerning him. The *Mahometans* call themſelves *Muſſelmen*, or rather (according to the true account of the *Arabick* word) † *Moſlemim*, i. e. *Believers*; and what difference is there be-

* Azoar 1. * Azoar 67. † From the Arabick verb *iſlam, credidit*, whence the Mahometan Religion is call'd *Iſlamiſmus.*

tween one of them and our Author's *Believer?* The former believes that Christ is a Good Man, and not above the nature of a Man, and sent of God to give Instructions to the world: and the Faith of the latter is of the very same scantling. Thus he confounds *Turky* with *Christendom*; and those that have been reckon'd as *Infidels* are with him *Christians*. He seems to have consulted the *Mahometan Bible*, which saith, * *Christ did not suffer on the cross, did not die*; for he and his Allies speak as meanly of *these Articles* as if there were no such thing. The Alcoran often talks (particularly see the *Last Chapter* of it) against Christ's being *the Son of God by Generation*. It is one of the First Principles of *Mahometism* that there is but *One God neither begetting nor begot*. See *Sulburgius's Saracenica*. This is it which our Author drives at when he labours to prove the *Messias* and *the Son of God* are terms synonymous, as you shall hear by and by. This reminds me of that Affinity and Correspondence which hath been between the *Turks* and this Gentleman's Party. † *Servetus* conferr'd notes with the *Alcoran*, when he un-

* Alcor. Azoar. 11. † De Trin. l. 1.

undertook to fetch an Argument out of it to diſprove the *Deity* of our Saviour. It is obſervable that thoſe Countreys of *Europe* which border on the *Sultan's* dominions, as *Hungary*, *Tranſilvania*, &c. abound with *Socinians* and *Antitrinitarians*. The inhabitants of theſe places accommodate themſelves to their Potent Neighbours, they make ſome approach to the *Conquerer's Creed*. Some of theſe men have lately got footing in *England*, and becauſe they and the *Great Turk* diſbelieve the *Trinity*, therefore we muſt all be Proſelytes to their opinion. They are making way for this by taking away all the Articles of the Chriſtian Faith but One. And our late Writer is the Inſtrument they make uſe of for this purpoſe. This Great Muſti hath given us a Hopeful Draught of *Chriſtianity*; and it was fit the Engliſh Reader ſhould know that a *Turk* according to him is a *Chriſtian*, for he makes the ſame Faith ſerve them both.

Nay, in the laſt place, let us take notice that this Gentleman preſents the world with a very Ill notion of *Faith*, for the very *Devils* are capable of all that *Faith* which he ſaith makes a *Chriſtian man*, yea of more, for we read that

they *believed Jesus to be the Son of God*, Mat. 8. 29. They cried out to him, *Thou art Christ the Son of God*, Luke 4. 41. which latter words in both places denote his *Divinity*, as I shall shew afterwards. But besides this *Historical Faith* (as it is generally call'd by Divines) which is giving credit to Evangelical Truths as barely reveal'd, there must be something else added to make up the True Substantial Faith of a *Christian*. With the Assent of the Understanding must be joyn'd the Consent or Approbation of the Will. All those Divine Truths which the Intellect assents to must be allow'd of by this Elective power of the Soul. True Evangelical Faith is a hearty Accepting of the Messias as he is offer'd in the Gospel. It is a sincere and impartial submission to all things requir'd by the *Evangelical Law*, which is contain'd in the *Epistles* as well as the *other Writings*. And to this Practical Assent and Choice there must be added likewise a firm Trust and Reliance in the Blessed Author of our Salvation. But this late Undertaker, who attempted to give us a more perfect account than ever was before of *Christianity as it is deliver'd in the Scriptures*, brings us no tidings of any such

Faith

Faith belonging to *Chriſtianity*, or diſcover'd to us in the *Scriptures*. Which gives us to underſtand that he verily believes there is no ſuch *Chriſtian Faith*, for in ſome of his Numerous Pages (eſpecially 191, 192, &c.) where he ſpeaks ſo much of *Belief* and *Faith*, he might have taken occaſion to inſert *one word* about this Compleat Faith of the Goſpel.

Having thus repreſented how *Defective*, how *Narrow*, how *Erroneous*, how *Miſtaken* this Unknown Writer's *Chriſtianity*, and eſpecially his *Faith* is; I will now proceed to ſhew how *Dangerous* and *Pernicious* this ſort of Doctrine is. Here is a Contrivance ſet up for the bringing in of *Darkneſs* and *Barbariſm* into the Chriſtian world. The only Neceſſary Point of Belief that the *Old Teſtament* delivers, is, according to theſe Gentlemen, that *there is One God*: and all the *New Teſtament* affords us as matter of Neceſſary Faith is this, that *Jeſus is the Meſſias*. Carry but theſe Two Articles along with you, and you are a True Chriſtian. There is no *Neceſſity* at all of being acquainted with the Reveal'd Doctrine concerning the Cauſe of Mankinds Degeneracy and Corruption, which gave occaſion to the *Meſſias's* Coming into the world.

world. There is no Neceſſity of knowing whether this *Meſſias* be God or Man, or both: there is no Neceſſity of underſtanding whether he came to ſuffer and dye in our ſtead, and to ſatisfie the Divine Juſtice, and to purchaſe Salvation for us by his Blood: There is no Neceſſity of believing that without Faith and Evangelical Obedience we cannot have any Benefit by the Meſſias: There is no Neceſſity of being perſwaded that our Salvation ſprings from the mere Grace and Bounty of Heaven: There is no Neceſſity of believing the Privileges and Rewards (both here and hereafter) which are entail'd on Chriſtianity. There is but a *Single Article of Belief*, and this is a very Short one too, *viz.* that *Jeſus is the Meſſias*; and if you aſſent to This you are as *Sound a Chriſtian* and as *Good a Believer* as this Gentleman can make you. One would think that ſeeing there are ſo many Branches of the Evangelical Faith commended to us and urged upon us by the Apoſtles in their Epiſtles (ſome of which our Saviour himſelf in the Goſpel, had made mention of) one would think, I ſay, that a man that hath a True Senſe of Chriſtianity, and is a Lover of Souls ſhould endeavour

deavour to diſplay before the world theſe Several Parts of the *Chriſtian Belief*, and ſhould be earneſt with men to embrace them All, and not to omit or neglect any of them, ſeeing they all ſo nearly concern their Everlaſting Welfare. But here comes One that makes it his great buſineſs to beat men off from taking notice of theſe Divine Truths, he repreſents them as wholly Unneceſſary to be believed, he cries down all Articles of Chriſtian Faith but One. He at this time of day, when *Chriſtianity* is ſo bright, ſtrives to darken and eclipſe it; he hides it from the faces of mankind, draws a thick Veil over it, will not ſuffer them to look into it, takes the Holy and Inſpired *Epiſtles* (which are as much the Word of God as the *Goſpels*) out of their way, and tells them again and again that a *Chriſtian man* or *Member of Chriſt* need not know or believe any more than that One Individual Point which he mentions.

Hear O ye Heavens, and give ear O Earth, judg whether this be not the way to introduce *Darkneſs* and *Ignorance* into Chriſtendom, whether this be not blinding of mens eyes, and depriving them of that Bleſſed Light which the Writings

Writings of the Evangeliſts and Apoſtles ſhould illuminate mens minds with. Which makes me think ſometimes (and perhaps the Reader doth ſo too) that this Writer and the other Confederates are Under-hand-Factors for that Communion (though they would ſeem to be much againſt it) which cries up *Ignorance* as the mother of Devotion and Religion. If they had not ſome ſuch deſign, why do they labour ſo induſtrioufly to keep the people in Ignorance, to tell them that One Article is enough for them, and that there is no *Neceſſity* of knowing any other doctrines of the Bible? Thus by following their *Italian* Maſter *Socinus*, they trade for that *Countrey*. And this *Vindicator* among the reſt trafficks very viſibly for it whileſt he blaſteth ſo ſubſtantial a part of the New Teſtament as the *Epiſtolary* Writings are. Would not one be apt to ſuſpect that (as their *Roman* Maſters have done) they would afterwards not only keep a part, but the Whole Scripture from the people? And ſo we ſhall travel to *Rome* by the way of *Racovia*.

And here you may ſee now what his Pretences of Love to *the bulk of mankind* come to. See how Sincere he

is

is in taking care of the *Salvation of their Souls*, which is a thing that he more than once mentions, and with ſome reflection (*p.* 9. *Vindicat.*) on me as if I diſregarded that Great Concern. But I hope I have in ſome meaſure faithfully diſcharged that part, though the *Great Judg* of heaven and earth knows my manifold deficiencies and failings in it; but I am well ſatisfied that this Inferior Inquiſitor cannot charge me with a neglect in that Great and Important Work, which I have made the buſineſs of my life. But behold how this Cenſorious Gentleman himſelf manifeſts his regard to the *Salvation of peoples Souls* when he puts out their Eyes, when he ſtudies how to nurſe them up in Ignorance and Blindneſs, and thereby to Ruine their Souls for ever. He can afford them but One Article out of the Whole New Teſtament. That muſt ſuffice them now, and perhaps afterwards it will be thought too much.

Here, before I proceed any further, I would take notice that the Project of the Neceſſity of but One Article of Chriſtian Belief is the direct Spawn and Product of *Socinianiſm*, but improved by this Author. He that hath convers'd with the

Uni-

Unitarian Writers is ſenſible how they endeavour to cramp our Belief and Knowledg, and cut off as many Fundamental Articles of Religion as they can. * They inſiſt upon this, that the Points neceſſary to be known are but *Few:* they interpret thoſe places of Scripture which directly ſpeak of *Knowing of God, i. e.* of knowing his Nature and Attributes, and other matters in Religion that are to be believed, concerning a *Practical Knowledg.* * *Socinus* leads the way, undervaluing the former ſort of Knowledg, and interpreting *Acts* 17. 27. *ſeeking the Lord, if haply they may feel after him, and find him,* concerning a Holy Life; whereas the plain ſcope of the place will convince any unprejudiced man that it is ſpoken of thoſe who being ignorant of God, labour to throw off that Ignorance, and to attain to a Knowledg of him, in order to their right worſhiping and ſerving him. The reſt follow this Ring-leader, and accordingly you may obſerve that in their *Definitions* of *Religion* they ſeldom (or never) inſert *Knowledg* as any part of it, but they wholly define it to be a Living according to

* Socin. de Cognit. Dei. Oſtorod. Inſtit. cap. 3, 4. Epiſcop. Apol. Remonſtr. ' Prælect. cap. 5.

to the Divine Precepts and Promiſes, or to be the Way to Eternal Life and Happineſs. Some of them ſeem to reſtrain that place, *John* 17.3. *that they might know thee the only true God*, &c. unto a Practical Knowledg. And in other particulars it might be ſhewed that they very much diſparage the *Doctrinal* Part of Chriſtianity, and more eſpecially take care to abbreviate and cut off the Fundamentals of it. *Crellius* is much for diminiſhing and reducing the knowledg and belief of the Articles of Faith. *The Sacred Writers* (ſaith * he) *when they ſpeak of that knowledg in which Religion, or the way to eternal life conſiſts, ſpeak not of that knowledg whereby any Attribute that is Eſſential to God or Chriſt is known.* Here is the Platform of our Gentleman's Deſign, and thence let the Reader gueſs whoſe part he takes. *Crellius* hath given him his Kue, and he very ſtrictly obſerves it: No Attribute that is Eſſential to God the Father (as Father) or Chriſt the Second Perſon in the Deity muſt come into his Creed, *i. e.* to be made a Neceſſary Article of it. And that the World may know that this is ac-

* De Uno Deo Patre. Sect. 1. cap. 1.

acceptable to the Party, one of them is choſen out to vindicate this Attempt of ſetting up One Article. A * Profeſſed *Socinian* Writer (and no Alien, but true *Engliſh* Breed) undertakes it, and applauds the Author, and defends his Work: that it may publickly appear that this is the doctrine of the *Racovians* or *Anti-Trinitarians*, and that it was not only begun to be entertained by the *Ancient* and *Outlandiſh Socinians*, but that now, when it is fully improved, it is vouched by the *Modern* and *Native* ones.

But what may be the Reaſon why both the *Exotick* and *Engliſh Unitarians* agree to maim the Heads of Chriſtianity, to contract its Articles, and to reduce it into ſo ſmall a compaſs? Seeing there are *Several* Fundamental Truths appertaining to the Chriſtian Religion, why are they not all pronounced Neceſſary to be believed and aſſented to? They have ſeveral reaſons for this; firſt, they are compell'd to do it becauſe otherwiſe they can't maintain that which ſo many of them profeſs to believe, *viz.* the Salvation of all men, of whaſoever Per-

* The Exceptions of Mr. E. againſt the *Reaſonableneſs of Chriſtianity* examin'd.

Perſwaſion they are. This is an extravagant Principle which they have taken up, and it is the Modiſh Opinion at this day, but if they ſhould hold that there is a *Neceſſity* of believing a conſiderable number of Articles in Chriſtianity, they could not poſſibly entertain this Faſhionable Notion. Secondly, they cunningly keep up this Conceit of the neceſſity of but One Article, becauſe it makes for their own Preſervation and Safety, that neither the Magiſtrate nor Eccleſiaſtical Power in any Country may take occaſion to animadvert upon them: for why ſhould they trouble and moleſt them for holding ſuch doctrines as are not of the Foundation of Religion, as are of no Neceſſity to be believed? This makes them forward to propagate their Notion. And hence alſo we ſee what is the reaſon of their talking ſo warmly for *Liberty*: This is done to Secure themſelves that though they broach never ſo Pernicious Opinions they may not fall under the laſh of the Magiſtrate. In brief, they would not be Puniſh'd here, and they think they have made ſure of hereafter by another Tenent of theirs. Thirdly, by vertue of this Expedient they can throw off any Doctrine when

they pleaſe, eſpecially thoſe Main Articles of the *Holy Trinity*, of *Chriſt's Satisfaction*, *&c.* for it is but ſaying that they are not neceſſary to be believed, (there being a Neceſſity of believing but One) and the buſineſs is done. Thus you ſee how it is their Concern to hold up their One Article.

But who ſees not that hereby they depreſs Chriſtianity, and unſpeakably injure the Faith of the Goſpel? What is the meaning of *Catechizing*, which hath been ſo univerſally commended and practiſed by the Ancients? There were in the Primitive Church particular perſons that made it their buſineſs to inſtruct and inform the ignorant in a *Catechetical* Way: yea, it was a Diſtinct Office among the Chriſtians of old. Saint *Mark* in the Church of *Alexandria* was a *Catechiſt*, *Pantænus* ſucceeded him, then *Origen* had the ſame Employment there, and *Heraclius* after him. What! was this only to teach *One Article* of Faith? Who but a *Socinian* can believe this? Is it not enough to rob us of our *God*, by denying *Chriſt* to be ſo, but muſt they ſpoil us of all the Other Articles of Chriſtian Faith but One? Who would think that the Popular Man, who

who pretends to take ſuch care of the *Multitude*, ſhould do them the greateſt Miſchief imaginable, whileſt he makes a ſhew of being extraordinarily kind to them? for a greater Miſchief there cannot be than to put them off with One Article of Chriſtian Belief, when there are Many others of abſolute neceſſity.

CHAP. V.

This Writer's doctrine tends to Irreligion *and* Atheism. *In what terms we may suppose the* Atheists *congratulate him. The clipping of the Articles of the* Creed *is a preparatory to the diminishing of the Precepts of the* Decalogue, *and the Petitions of the* Lord's Prayer. Obj. *Doth not the* frequent *mentioning of this Article* [Jesus is the Messias] *in the New Testament; yea, the* sole *mentioning of it in some places argue that there is no other Article of Faith which is* necessarily *to be believed but this?* Answ. *No: because* 1. *the believing of* Jesus *to be the promised* Messias *was the first step to Christianity, and therefore is so often propounded in the Evangelical Writings.* 2. *Though this* One *Article be mentioned alone in some places, it is to be supposed that* other *matters of Faith were at the same time proposed, though they are not recorded.* 3. *We must supply those places of Scripture where this* One *Article is set down alone from others which make mention of* Other *Necessary Points of Belief.* 4. *The clear discovery of the doctrines of the Gospel was* gradual; *and therefore*

we

we must not think that in the Four Evangelists *and* Acts *are specified all the Necessary Articles of Faith, but we must look for some of them in the* Epistolary *Writings, when the Spirit of God had further enlightned the Apostles and other Christians.*

AND now, to prove yet further the *Pernicious* Nature of his Writings, doth any man doubt of their Tendency to *Irreligion* and *Atheism*? I charge him not with any such thing as a formal designing of this. (No: I will not entertain such a thought) but I only take notice how serviceable his Papers and Opinions are to this purpose. He hath mightily gratified the *Atheistical* Rabble by this his Enterprize, and accordingly we may suppose them in such Words as these to express their great Obligations and Thankfulness to him on this occasion; "We are beholding to this Worthy "Adventurer for ridding the world of so "Great an Encumbrance, *viz.* that "huge Mass and unweildy Body of "Christianity which took up so much "room. Now we see that it was this "*Bulk*, and not that of *Mankind* which he "had an eye to when he so often menti-

"on'd this latter. This is a Phyſician
"for our turn indeed: we like this Chy-
"mical Operator that doth not trouble
"us with a parcel of Heavy Drugs of no
"value, but contracts all into a Few Spi-
"rits, nay doth his buſineſs with a *Sin-*
"*gle Drop*. We have been in bondage a
"long time to *Creeds* and *Catechiſms*, *Sy-*
"*ſtems* and *Confeſſions*, we have been
"plagued with a tedious Beadroll of *Ar-*
"*ticles* which our Reverend Divines
"have told us we muſt make the matter
"of our *Faith*. Yea ſo it is, both Con-
"formiſts and Nonconformiſts (though
"diſagreeing in ſome other things) have
"agreed in This to moleſt and crucifie
"us. But this Noble Writer (we thank
"him) hath ſet us free, and eas'd us by
"bringing down all the Chriſtian Faith
"into One Point. We have heard ſome
"men talk of the *Epiſtolary* Compoſures
"of the *New Teſtament*, as if Great Mat-
"ters were contain'd in them, as if the
"great *Myſteries* of Chriſtianity (as they
"call them) were unfolded there: but we
"could never make any thing of them;
"and now we find that this Writer is
"partly of our opinion. He tells us
"that theſe are Letters ſent *upon occaſion*,
"but we are not to look for our *Religi-*

"*on*

"*on* (for now for this Gentleman's ſake we
"begin to talk of *Religion*) in theſe places.
"We believe it, and we believe that there
"is no Religion but in thoſe very *Chap-*
"*ters* and *Verſes* which he hath ſet down
"in his Treatiſe. What need we have any
"other part of the *New Teſtament?* That
"is Bible enough, if not too much.
"Happy, thrice happy ſhall this Au-
"thor be perpetually eſteemed by us,
"we will Chronicle him as our Friend
"and Benefactor. It is not our way to
"*Saint* people: otherwiſe we would
"certainly *Canonize* this Gentleman,
"and, when our hand is in, his pair of
"Bookſellers for their being ſo benefici-
"al to the World in Publiſhing ſo Rich a
"Treaſure. It was a Bleſſed Day when
"this hopeful Birth ſaw the light, for
"hereby all the *Orthodox Creed-makers*
"and *Syſtematick Men* are ruined for ever.
"In brief, if we be for any *Chriſtianity*,
"it ſhall be this Author's, for that
"agrees with us ſingularly well, it be-
"ing ſo ſhort, all couch'd in four words,
"neither more nor leſs. It is a very
"fine Compendium, and we are infi-
"nitely obliged to this Great Reformer
"for it. We are glad at heart that *Chri-*
"*ſtianity* is brought ſo low by this Wor-

" thy Pen-man, for this is a good presage " that it will dwindle into Nothing. What! " but *One Article*, and that so *Brief* too! " We like such a Faith, and such a Re- " ligion because it is so near to None.

And is not the Reader satisfied that such language as this hath real Truth in it? Doth he not perceive that the discarding of all the Articles but One makes way for the casting off that too? And may we not expect that those who deal thus with the *Creed* will use the same method in reducing the *Ten Commandments* and the *Lord's Prayer*, abbreviating the former into One Precept, and the latter into One Petition? So that not only our Faith but our Practice and Devotion shall be crampt. There is as much reason to do one as the other: and they that have done the former will in time, it is no doubt, use the same discipline towards the latter, *i. e.* lop off some of the Precepts of the Decalogue, and diminish that Form and Pattern of Prayer which our Saviour hath left us.

Thus this Writer sees how fitly his book of the *Reasonableness of Christianity*, &c. *was brought into my Discourse about the Causes and Occasions of Atheism*, which he seems to wonder at, *p.* 2. It ap-

appears alſo that if *I gave his book an Ill Name* (as he complains,) it doth deſerve it, and that it hath not only a *Socinian* but an *Atheiſtick Tang.* I have proved (and ſhall yet further do it in this preſent Undertaking) that he hath corrupted mens minds, depraved the Goſpel, and abuſed Chriſtianity. And is there no *Atheiſm* in this? To conclude, if after all he will ſtand to his Propoſition, and aſſert there is but One Article of Faith (juſt one and no more, and it is ſure there can be no leſs) neceſſarily to be aſſented to, he may enjoy his Confident Humour, but it is to be hoped that there is not any conſiderable number of men in the world that will admit of ſuch an Unaccountable Paradox, and forfeit their Reaſons merely to pleaſe their Fancy.

But becauſe I deſign'd theſe Papers for the ſatisfying of the Readers *Doubts* about any thing occurring concerning the matter before us, and for the eſtabliſhing of his wavering mind, I will here (before I paſs to the Second General Head of my Diſcourſe) anſwer a *Query* or *Objection* which ſome, and not without ſome ſhew of Ground, may be apt to ſtart. How comes it to paſs, they will ſay, that this Article

Article of Faith, *viz.* that *Jesus is the Messias* or *Christ*, is so often repeated in the *New Testament*? Why is *this* sometimes urged without the mentioning of any *other* Article of Belief? Doth not this plainly shew that this is *All* that is requir'd to be believ'd as Necessary to make a man a Christian? May we not infer from the frequent and sole repetition of this Article in several places of the *Evangelist* and the *Acts* that there is no other Point of Faith of absolute necessity, but that this alone is sufficient to constitute a man a True Member of Christ?

To clear this *Objection*, and to give a full and satisfactory Answer to all doubts in this affair, I offer these ensuing Particulars, which will lead the Reader to the right understanding of the whole case.

1. It must be consider'd that the believing of *Jesus* to be the promised *Messias* was the *first step* to Christianity; and therefore This rather than any other Article was propounded to be believ'd by all those whom either our Saviour or the Apostles invited to imbrace Christianity. If they would not, if they did not give credit to This in the first place, viz. That *Jesus* of *Nazareth* was that Eminent

Eminent and Extraordinary Perſon propheſied of long before, and that he was Sent and Commiſſion'd by God, there could be no hope that they would attend unto any other Propoſal relating to the *Chriſtian Religion.* This is the true reaſon why that Article was conſtantly propounded to be believ'd by all that look'd towards Chriſtianity, and why it is mention'd ſo often in the Evangelical Writings. It was that which *made way* for the embracing of all the other Articles, it was the *paſſage* to all the reſt. But our Anonymous Author not thinking of this, but obſerving that this One Article was uſually required to be aſſented to in the Goſpel-Writings, he thence inconſiderately concludes that this is the *Whole* of the Chriſtian Belief, and that there is nothing elſe to be *neceſſarily* aſſented to, to make a man a Chriſtian. I am ſorry to ſee that a perſon of ſome Senſe can have ſo little a feeling of the True Nature and Import of *Chriſtianity*, that he can harbour ſuch a thought as this, that all the neceſſary part of our Belief is ſumm'd up in a bare giving aſſent to this Propoſition, *Jeſus is the Meſſias.* He miſtakes a part of Chriſtian Faith for All, and the Entrance and Beginning

of

of it for the full Conſummation of it.

2. It is to be remembred that though this One Propoſition or Article be mention'd alone in ſome places, yet there is reaſon to think and be perſwaded that at the ſame time *other* Matters of Faith were propoſed. For it is confeſs'd by all Intelligent and Obſerving men that the Hiſtory of the Scripture is conciſe, and that in relating of matter of Fact many paſſages are omitted by the Sacred Penmen. Wherefore though but this One Article of belief (becauſe it is a Leading one, and makes way for the reſt) be expreſly mention'd in ſome of the *Goſpels*, yet we muſt not conclude thence that no other matter of Faith was requir'd to be admitted of. For things are briefly ſet down in the Evangelical Records, and we muſt *ſuppoſe* many things which are not in direct terms related. The not attending to this hath been one occaſion of the preſent miſtake. Hence it was that this Narrow-minded Writer ſhuts up all in the belief of *Jeſus's* being the *Chriſt*.

3. This alſo muſt be thought of, that though there are Several parts and members of the Chriſtian Faith, yet they do not all occur in any *One* place of Scripture.

ture. This is well known to thoſe that are converſant in the Writings of the New Teſtament, and therefore when in ſome places only *One* ſingle part of the Chriſtian Faith is made mention of, as neceſſarily to be imbrac'd in order to Salvation, we muſt be careful not to take it alone, but to ſupply it from ſeveral *other* places, which make mention of other Neceſſary and Indiſpenſable Points of Belief. I will give the Reader a plain Inſtance of this, *Rom.* 10. 9. *If thou ſhalt believe in thy heart that God hath rais'd him* (i. e. the Lord Jeſus) *from the dead, thou ſhalt be ſaved.* Here *One Article of Faith*, viz. the belief of Chriſt's Reſurrection (becauſe it is of ſo great importance in Chriſtianity) is only mention'd; but all the reſt muſt be ſuppoſed, becauſe they are mention'd in other places. And conſequently, if we would give an impartial account of our Belief, we muſt conſult thoſe places: and they are not all together, but diſpers'd here and there: wherefore we muſt look them out, and acquaint our ſelves with the Several Particulars which make up our Belief, and render it entire and conſummate. But our haſty Author took another courſe, and thereby deceiv'd

ceiv'd himſelf, and unhappily deceives others.

4. This (which is the Main Anſwer to the Objection) muſt be born in our minds that *Chriſtianity* was erected by degrees, according to that prediction and promiſe of our Saviour, that *the Spirit ſhould teach them all things*, John 14. 26. and that *he ſhould guide them into all truth*, John 16. 13. *viz.* after his Departure and Aſcenſion, when the Holy Ghoſt was to be ſent in a ſpecial manner to enlighten mens minds, and to diſcover to them the great Myſteries of Chriſtianity. This is to be Noted by us, as that which gives great light in the preſent caſe. The diſcovery of the Doctrines of the Goſpel was *Gradual*. It was by certain ſteps that *Chriſtianity* climb'd to its heighth. We are not to think then that all the Neceſſary doctrines of the Chriſtian Religion were clearly publiſh'd to the world in our Saviour's time. Not but that all that were neceſſary for *that time* were publiſhed: but ſome which were neceſſary for the *ſucceeding one* were not then diſcover'd, or at leaſt not fully. They had ordinarily no belief before Chriſt's *Death* and *Reſurrection* of thoſe Subſtantial Articles, *i.e.* that he ſhould

ſhould die and riſe again: but we read in the *Acts* and in the *Epiſtles* that theſe were Formal Articles of Faith afterwards, and are ever ſince neceſſary to compleat the Chriſtian Belief. So as to other Great Verities, the Goſpel increaſed by degrees, and was not Perfect at once. Which furniſhes us with a reaſon why moſt of the Choiceſt and Sublimeſt Truths of Chriſtianity are to be met with in the *Epiſtles* of the Apoſtles, they being ſuch doctrines as were not clearly diſcover'd and open'd in the *Goſpels* and the *Acts*.

Thus I have, I conceive, amply ſatisfied the foregoing *Objection*, and I hope the Reader is convinc'd of the True Grounds why we muſt not expect all Neceſſary Points of Chriſtianity in the Writings of the four Evangeliſts. If our preſent Writer had thought of this, and had diſtinguiſh'd of *Times*, he had not formed ſuch an Ill Notion of *Chriſtianity* as we find he hath done. But it is not only upon *Miſtake* that this Author proceeds: his fault is much worſe. It is too apparent that by this Abbreviating of *Chriſtianity*, and by his voluntary neglecting what the *Epiſtolary* Writings deliver, he de-

designs to exclude those Fundamental Doctrines which have been owned as such in the Church of Christ. So much for the *First General Head* which I propounded to insist upon.

CHAP.

CHAP. VI.

The next General Charge against him is, that the Texts of Scripture which reſpect the HOLY TRINITY are diſregarded by him, or interpreted after the Anti-Trinitarian Mode. *This is proved from plain Inſtances. The latter more eſpecially is evidenced from his interpreting the* Meſſias *and the* Son of God *to be the very ſame as to ſignification, and that no more is denoted by one term than by the other. The Weakneſs of the* Socinian *Arguing on this occaſion fully laid open: and the Texts where theſe terms are mentioned plainly cleared. A Text produced and urged that confutes the vain ſurmiſes of the* Racovians *about thoſe expreſſions, and that reduces them to an unavoidable* Abſurdity. The Meſſias *is a Title of Chriſt's Office:* The Son of God *is the Title of his Divinity. The former is founded on his Miſſion from the* Father: *The latter on his Peculiar Property as he is the Second Perſon in the Sacred Trinity; and conſequently they are not ſynonymous terms. The Gentleman would wind in two Learned* Prelates, *but his attempt proves ineffectual.*

fectual. He is given to Shuffling. He abuſes Scripture by quoting it.

MY *next Charge* againſt this Gentleman was this, that thoſe Texts of Scripture which reſpect the Holy *Trinity* were either diſregarded by him, or were interpreted by him after the *Antitrinitarian* Mode. And this he is ſo far from denying, that he openly avows it, *Vindic. p.* 22, 23. By which he hath made it clear that he eſpouſes that doctrine of the *Socinians*. When I had offer'd thoſe two plain Texts, *Mat.* 28. 19. *John* 1. 1. to prove the doctrine of the Bleſſed *Trinity*, he takes no care to give any Reſolution about them, though he was abſolutely oblig'd to do it, becauſe thoſe Texts are not in the *Epiſtles*, but in the *Goſpels*, out of which latter he ſaith he made his *Collection of Articles*, but he ſhould rather have ſaid (and that with Truth) out of which he drew One Article. Nay, which is more ſtrange, though he particularly mentions, *p.* 9. my taking notice of his omitting theſe Texts in his Treatiſe, nay though he ſets them down at large in his *Vindication*, yet he hath the confidence to run preſently to another thing, and he

he ſhifts it off by one impertinent matter or other, and ſaith not one ſyllable with reference to thoſe Famous Texts which are ſuch remarkable teſtimonies to the doctrine of the *Trinity*. Who could do this but a *Socinianiz'd* Writer? And who could do this but a man that was wholly careleſs of his Credit, and did not care how he acted? And this very thing doth moreover ſhew that this Author (let him pretend what he will) is as great a deſpiſer of the *Goſpels* (when any thing in them doth not ſerve his turn) as he is of the *Epiſtles*. This will perpetually ſtick upon him, and he will never be able to wipe it off. If ever he accounts for this, he muſt at the ſame time make an acknowledgment of his crazy memory, and of ſomething worſe.

Again, as it is evident that he rejects the Doctrine of the Bleſſed *Trinity*, ſo more eſpecially and particularly he waves that of the *Deity* of our Saviour. Which appears from this that he juſtifies the Charge againſt him, *viz.* that he made theſe terms [*the Meſſias*] and [*the Son of God*] the very ſame as to Signification, *p.* 23. *Vindic.* Which is the very

deſigns to exclude thoſe Fundamental Doctrines which have been owned as ſuch in the Church of Chriſt. So much for the *Firſt General Head* which I propounded to inſiſt upon.

CHAP.

CHAP. VI.

The next General Charge against him is, that the Texts of Scripture which reſpect the HOLY TRINITY are diſregarded by him, or interpreted after the Anti-Trinitarian Mode. *This is proved from plain Inſtances. The latter more eſpecially is evidenced from his interpreting the* Meſſias *and the* Son of God *to be the very ſame as to ſignification, and that no more is denoted by one term than by the other. The Weakneſs of the* Socinian *Arguing on this occaſion fully laid open: and the Texts where theſe terms are mentioned plainly cleared. A Text produced and urged that confutes the vain ſurmiſes of the* Racovians *about thoſe expreſſions, and that reduces them to an unavoidable* Abſurdity. The Meſſias *is a Title of Chriſt's Office:* The Son of God *is the Title of his Divinity. The former is founded on his Miſſion from the* Father: *The latter on his Peculiar Property as he is the Second Perſon in the Sacred Trinity; and conſequently they are not ſynonymous terms. The Gentleman would wind in two Learned* Prelates, *but his attempt proves ineffectual.*

fectual. He is given to Shuffling. He abuſes Scripture by quoting it.

MY *next Charge* againſt this Gentleman was this, that thoſe Texts of Scripture which reſpect the Holy *Trinity* were either diſregarded by him, or were interpreted by him after the *Antitrinitarian* Mode. And this he is ſo far from denying, that he openly avows it, *Vindic. p.* 22, 23. By which he hath made it clear that he eſpouſes that doctrine of the *Socinians*. When I had offer'd thoſe two plain Texts, *Mat.* 28. 19. *John* 1. 1. to prove the doctrine of the Bleſſed *Trinity*, he takes no care to give any Reſolution about them, though he was abſolutely oblig'd to do it, becauſe thoſe Texts are not in the *Epiſtles*, but in the *Goſpels*, out of which latter he ſaith he made his *Collection of Articles*, but he ſhould rather have ſaid (and that with Truth) out of which he drew One Article. Nay, which is more ſtrange, though he particularly mentions, *p.* 9. my taking notice of his omitting theſe Texts in his Treatiſe, nay though he ſets them down at large in his *Vindication*, yet he hath the confidence to run preſently to another thing, and he

he ſhifts it off by one impertinent matter or other, and ſaith not one ſyllable with reference to thoſe Famous Texts which are ſuch remarkable teſtimonies to the doctrine of the *Trinity*. Who could do this but a *Socinianiz'd* Writer? And who could do this but a man that was wholly careleſs of his Credit, and did not care how he acted? And this very thing doth moreover ſhew that this Author (let him pretend what he will) is as great a deſpiſer of the *Goſpels* (when any thing in them doth not ſerve his turn) as he is of the *Epiſtles*. This will perpetually ſtick upon him, and he will never be able to wipe it off. If ever he accounts for this, he muſt at the ſame time make an acknowledgment of his crazy memory, and of ſomething worſe.

Again, as it is evident that he rejects the Doctrine of the Bleſſed *Trinity*, ſo more eſpecially and particularly he waves that of the *Deity* of our Saviour. Which appears from this that he juſtifies the Charge againſt him, *viz.* that he made theſe terms [*the Meſſias*] and [*the Son of God*] the very ſame as to Signification, *p.* 23. *Vindic.* Which is the very

fectual. He is given to Shuffling. He abuſes Scripture by quoting it.

MY *next Charge* againſt this Gentleman was this, that thoſe Texts of Scripture which reſpect the Holy *Trinity* were either diſregarded by him, or were interpreted by him after the *Anti-trinitarian* Mode. And this he is ſo far from denying, that he openly avows it, *Vindic. p.* 22, 23. By which he hath made it clear that he eſpouſes that doctrine of the *Socinians.* When I had offer'd thoſe two plain Texts, *Mat.* 28. 19. *John* 1. 1. to prove the doctrine of the Bleſſed *Trinity*, he takes no care to give any Reſolution about them, though he was abſolutely oblig'd to do it, becauſe thoſe Texts are not in the *Epiſtles*, but in the *Goſpels*, out of which latter he ſaith he made his *Collection of Articles*, but he ſhould rather have ſaid (and that with Truth) out of which he drew One Article. Nay, which is more ſtrange, though he particularly mentions, *p.* 9. my taking notice of his omitting theſe Texts in his Treatiſe, nay though he ſets them down at large in his *Vindication*, yet he hath the confidence to run preſently to another thing, and he

he ſhifts it off by one impertinent matter or other, and ſaith not one ſyllable with reference to thoſe Famous Texts which are ſuch remarkable teſtimonies to the doctrine of the *Trinity*. Who could do this but a *Socinianiz'd* Writer? And who could do this but a man that was wholly careleſs of his Credit, and did not care how he acted? And this very thing doth moreover ſhew that this Author (let him pretend what he will) is as great a deſpiſer of the *Goſpels* (when any thing in them doth not ſerve his turn) as he is of the *Epiſtles*. This will perpetually ſtick upon him, and he will never be able to wipe it off. If ever he accounts for this, he muſt at the ſame time make an acknowledgment of his crazy memory, and of ſomething worſe.

Again, as it is evident that he rejects the Doctrine of the Bleſſed *Trinity*, ſo more eſpecially and particularly he waves that of the *Deity* of our Saviour. Which appears from this that he juſtifies the Charge againſt him, *viz.* that he made theſe terms [*the Meſſias*] and [*the Son of God*] the very ſame as to Signification, *p.* 23. *Vindic.* Which is the very

ry thing that * *Slichtingius* and other *Racovians* inſiſt upon, and make a great ſtir about. And herein they write after †their Maſter, who largely purſues this Argument (for ſo he reckons it to be,) *viz.* that there is no difference between the Name *Chriſt* or *Meſſias* and that other *the Son of God*. He alledges the very ſame Text that our *Vindicator* doth, and ſome others. He argues from *Matt.* 16. 16. compared with *Luk.* 9. 20. *Thou art Chriſt the Son of the living God*, ſaith the former place: *Thou art the Chriſt of God*, ſaith the latter: therefore *Chriſt* and *the Son of God* are not only the ſame perſon, but theſe two expreſſions ſignifie the very ſame thing and no more. What a weak and pitiful Conſequence is this? For it is grounded on this abſurd bottom, namely, that when any of the *Evangeliſts* ſpeak about the ſame matter, if one of them adds ſome words, yea, ſome material Paſſages which are not in the other, theſe muſt be reckoned to be the very ſame with what the other ſaid, though they were utterly omitted by him. Then we may argue thus, St. *Matthew* ſaith, *Chriſt began to preach, and*

* Cont. Meiſner. de Trin. † Socin. cont. Wiek. cap. 5.

and to ſay, Repent, Mat. 4. 17. St. *Mark* ſaith, *He preach'd the Goſpel, ſaying, Repent ye, and believe the Goſpel, Mark* 1. 14, 15. therefore Repenting and Believing are the ſame, and there is no difference between them. Would not a Man be hooted at for ſuch Arguing as this? Yet this is the very Reaſoning of our *Racovian*, and of this late Proſelyte of theirs. In one Evangeliſt he ſaith, our Saviour is called *Chriſt*, in another the *Son of God*, therefore the denominations of the *Son of God* and *Chriſt* are identified. Again, they endeavour to prove it from comparing *Mat.* 26. 63. *Mark* 14. 61. with *Luk.* 22. 67. In the former places 'tis related that the High Prieſt asked our Saviour whether he was *the Son of God, the Son of the Bleſſed:* in the latter, whether he was *the Chriſt.* Whence they roundly conclude that thoſe Names *Chriſt and the Son of God* are ſynonymous. But they do this without any ſhew of reaſon, becauſe they cannot (as * *Slichtingius himſelf* confeſſes) ſimply from an Omiſſion infer the identity of the things which are expreſſed and which are left out, *viz.* in the Writings

* Cont. Meiſner. de Trin.

of the Evangeliſt : and conſequently their Arguing is vain and groundleſs. The plain and ſatisfactory Anſwer to it is this, that St. *Luke* (guided by the Holy Ghoſt in giving the Narrative of what was done relating to our Lord) omitted the particular words which the other Evangeliſts have : and this is uſual with all the Evangeliſts at one time or other. But a man can't infer thence that the words and expreſſions which are uſed by them are of the ſame import and ſignification. After this rate, when I read that *Chriſt fell upon his face*, *Mat.* 26. 39. and that *he fell on the ground*, *Mark* 14.35.and that *he fell on his knees* for ſo 'tis in the Greek) *Luk.* 22.41. I may conclude that *face* and *ground* and *knees* are the very ſame thing, and one of them ſignifies no more than the other. This is the wild Logick of theſe men. Can there be a more extravagant way of talking than this? Eſpecially if we remember what Pretences to Reaſon and Good Senſe theſe men make above the reſt of mankind. There are other Texts quoted by our Author to prove that there is no difference between *Chriſt* and *the Son of God* as to the ſignification of the words, but they may eaſily be anſwered from what

I have ſaid concerning the interpretation of the foregoing Texts.

There is one place (to name no more) which confutes all the foreſaid ſurmiſes of the *Socinians* about the identity of thoſe Terms: it is that famous Confeſſion of Faith which the *Ethiopian Eunuch* made when *Philip* told him that he might be baptized if he *believed*; *Acts* 8. 37. *I believe*, ſaith he, *that Jeſus Chriſt is the Son of God.* This without doubt was ſaid according to that apprehenſion which he had of *Chriſt* from *Philip's* inſtructing him, for it is ſaid *he preached unto him Jeſus*, *v.* 35. He had acquainted him that Jeſus was the *Chriſt*, the *Anointed* of God, and alſo that he was the *Son of God*, which includes in it that he was *God.* And accordingly this Noble Proſelyte gives this account of his Faith, in order to his being baptiz'd, in order to his being admitted a Member of Chriſt's Church, *I believe that Jeſus is the Son of God*, or you may read it according to the Greek, *I believe the Son of God to be Jeſus Chriſt.* Where there are theſe two diſtinct Propoſitions, 1. That *Jeſus* is the *Chriſt*, the *Meſſias*, 2. That he is not only the *Meſſias*, but the *Son of God.* If you do not own theſe two Propoſiti-

ons included in his words, you must say that the *Eunuch* (though instructed by *Philip*) spoke Non-sense, for if *to be Christ* and *to be the Son of God* are of the same signification, then his words sound thus, *I believe that Jesus Christ is Christ, I believe the Messias is the Messias.* This absolutely follows from the foresaid Notion, that *the Messias* and *the Son of God* are synonymous. So then here is an Absurd Tautology instead of a Sober Confession of Faith from this Eminent Convert: and *Philip* accepts of it as a good and right profession of his Belief. This you must grant, or else you must acknowledg that the *Messias* and *Son of God* are not of the same signification, but are distinctly attributed to *Jesus*. These words will force you to acknowledg this, for in saying he believes *Christ to be the Son of God*, or that *the Son of God is Christ*, he lets us know that these two, *viz.* to be the *Messias* and to be the *Son of God* are different things (though they meet in the same Person) and consequently that in all those places (which are very many) where *the Son of God* is added to *the Messias*, we must understand it as an addition to the Sense: whereas according to this Writer and his Complices these two are identified

tified: and conſequently here is a *Non-ſenſical Reiteration* in the words, for they amount to no more than this, *I believe Jeſus Chriſt to be Chriſt.* This is that Abſurdity which they are reduced to.

But yet I will ſubjoyn this, that we are not unwilling to grant that our Saviour is ſometimes call'd *the Son of God* becauſe of his * Miraculous Conception, alſo becauſe of the Dignity of his † Miſſion, and ſometimes becauſe of his ‖ Reſurrection. But then we ſay that theſe do not exclude another, and higher cauſe of this Appellation, *viz.* his ** *Eternal Filiation:* he was begotten from Eternity of the ſubſtance of the Father by an ineffable Generation. If then we will ſpeak of theſe two Denominations diſtinctly and properly, we muſt ſay that one is the Name of his *Office*, the other of his *Divinity*, and conſequently that *Chriſt* and *the Son of God* are not expreſſions of the ſame latitude and import. And how indeed can they be? For they have different foundations, the one hath its riſe from the Divine Miſſion, *viz.* that of the *Father*, who ſent and anointed him to

* Luke 1. 35. † John 10. 36. ‖ Acts 13. 32, 33.
** John 3. 16. Rom. 5. 8. 2 Cor. 11. 31.

to be a Saviour: the other is grounded in the ſingular and peculiar Property of the Second Perſon in the Sacred Trinity, and ſo is the Name of his Perſon. Wherefore it is moſt irrationally and abſurdly done of our Late Convert, in a fond Imitation of his Brethren, to confound theſe two which are really Diſtinct. I mention'd this as a proof of his being a *Socinian*, and he lets it remain a Proof, and ſo do I. But here I would only obſerve that he and they proceed in a *Preposterous* manner when they tell us that *Chriſt* is called *the Son of God*, becauſe of his Office and its Dignity, whereas it is evident that he had the Office and Dignity, becauſe he was *the Son of God*, and becauſe none could perform the Office but he that was ſo. He was not *God* (a *Metaphorical God*, as the *Socinians* ſometimes make him) becauſe he was *Chriſt* or the *Meſſias*: but he was the *Meſſias* becauſe he was *God*, even the *True God*. He was *the Chriſt of God* becauſe he was *the Son of God*: And this *Filiation*, in its ſtricteſt and propereſt ſenſe, implies his *Divine Nature*, and his Coeſſentiality with the *Father*.

He would here wind in (*p.* 23.) the late Archbiſhop of *Canterbury*, as if he under-

underſtood the foregoing Terms as the *Socinians* do. But his words that are cited do not neceſſarily import any ſuch thing, for *Nathanael* might own our Saviour to be the *Meſſias*, and call him *the Son of God*, and yet it doth not follow thence that the ſignification of both theſe Appellations is the ſame, or that the *Archbiſhop* thought ſo. And he would make uſe of the Authority of an Other *Prelate*, now living, of extraordinary Worth and Learning, who ſpeaking only in a *general* way repreſents theſe two as the ſame thing, *viz.* that *Jeſus is the Chriſt*, and that *Jeſus is the Son of God*, becauſe theſe expreſſions are applied to the ſame Perſon, and becauſe they are both comprehended in one general Name, *viz. Jeſus*. Yet it doth not follow thence but that if we will ſpeak ſtrictly and cloſely we muſt be forced to confeſs that they are of different ſignifications; for we have different Ideas and notions of them, the one being the Name of our Saviour's Office, the other of his Perſon and Eternal Filiation. But our Gentleman adheres to his good Patrons and Friends the *Racovians*, and pronounces them the very ſame. And we may, for this as well as other reaſons, pronounce him

him the ſame with thoſe Gentlemen. Which you may perceive he is very apprehenſive of, and thinks that this will be reckon'd a good Evidence of his being what he denied himſelf to be before. *The Point is gain'd*, ſaith he, *and I am openly a Socinian.* p. 23. He never uttered truer words in his life, and they are the Confutation of all his Pretences to the contrary. This Truth, which unwarily dropt from his pen, confirms what I have laid to his charge, that he did read the foreſaid Texts with *Socinian* Spectacles, that he interpreted them after the *Racovian* Mode, that he paſſed by Other Texts, yea, the *Whole Epiſtles* themſelves, becauſe he was ſenſible how many Illuſtrious Atteſtations to the doctrine of the ever to be Adored Trinity are contained in them.

It is true, he tells us that *he never read the Socinian Writers*, *p.* 22. but we know his Shuffling is ſuch that there is no depending on his word. But ſuppoſe he did not *read* thoſe Authors, yet he doth not deny that he hath *Convers'd* with ſome of them, and hath heard their Notions and Arguments: and this indeed he intimates to us when he lets us know that the *generality of Divines he more converſes*

verſes with are not *Racovians*, *p.* 22. which intimates that there are ſome *Particular Divines* he *leſs converſes with* that are of another way. What ſhall we ſay? The Gentleman is a *Racovian*, and yet pretends he doth not know it. So we muſt number him among the *Ignoramus-Socinians* (as they tell us in their late Papers of *Ignoramus Trinitarians*) which is one ſort of thoſe folks it ſeems.

I will only further take notice here of what was truly ſaid before he was aware, that *it was a dull work with him to quote Scripture*, *p.* 25. He hath ſufficiently convinced the world, in his numerous Quotations of Scripture, that it was ſo. He might have added, it is *a diabolical work*, for in quoting Scripture after that rate which he is guilty of, he doth but follow his Pattern in *Mat.* 4. 6. His handling of Scripture, and making that uſe of it which he doth, is an Abuſing of it. Such treating of the Holy Book is deſecrating it; and whileſt he talks Scripture, he prophanes it. So that *a Socinian begins to mend when he leaves this work off*, (*p.* 25.) in compariſon of what he did before. So much for the Second Charge.

CHAP.

CHAP. VII.

The last General Charge against him is, that when he professedly enumerates the ADVANTAGES of our Saviour's Coming, he hath not one syllable of his SATISFYING for us. *Hence it is rationally inferr'd that he favours* Racovianism. *He endeavours to evade this by pretending that in other places he uses such terms as import* Satisfaction. *Herein he is refuted. His* Dissimulation *discovered. Even whilest he proclaims himself a* Socinian, *he labours to disguise it. Which argues his* Weakness *and* Insincerity. *His Book is unworthy of the specious* Title *which he prefixes to it. The* Author's *Conclusion of the foregoing debates.*

ANother Proof, or rather Demonstration of our Author's being a Disciple of *Socinus* is this, that when *he mentions the Advantages and Benefits of Christ's Coming into the world, he hath not one syllable of his Satisfying for us, or by his Death purchasing life and salvation, or any thing that sounds like it.* He makes nothing of the force of this Evidence, wherefore it will be proper now to set it be-

before the Reader in its true and native light. He that was giving an Account of the *Reaſonableneſs of Chriſtianity*, and was more particularly making it his *buſineſs* to ſhew for what *End* and *Purpoſe* Chriſt appear'd in the fleſh, and to let his Readers know what *Good* and *Advantage* were brought to them by the *Meſſias*, he (I ſay) when he was about this work, and *Deſignedly* undertook it in this part of his book, was obliged to declare that one great Advantage of the *Meſſias*s Coming was to take away our ſins by Expiating them, that one Main End of his Coming was to make Satisfaction for us, and thereby to purchaſe life and glory. But this New Convert hath not any thing that ſounds like it in this place, where he *profeſſedly* took upon him to acquaint us *what are the Advantages* which accrue to us by the *Meſſias*. Though he hath the confidence to ſtruggle with many other parts of the *Charges* againſt him, yet here he ſubmits, and grants *(p. 5. Vind.)* he hath no ſuch thing in the place where the *Advantages* of Chriſt's Coming are purpoſely treated of. And if by his own acknowledgment he hath no ſuch thing when he reckons up the *Advantages* and *Bleſſings* of Chriſt's appearing in the world,

world, then every intelligent man knows what Inference to make, *viz.* that this Author was of opinion that Christ came not to Satisfie for us, and to purchase life for us by vertue of his Death, which is one of the Grand Points of *Socinianism*.

The force of this Inference is unavoidable, and it will attack our Adversary, be he never so cunning at Evasions, be he never so closely intrench'd in his Equivocations. For where should we expect this to be mention'd, if it be not expressly taken notice of in that part or division of his Treatise where he Purposely sets forth the *Benefits* of the Messias's Arrival? If he doth not make express mention of it here, it is either because he forgot it, (but he owns no such thing) or because he was careless (but he doth not think himself, whatever others do, to be such a Writer) or because he wilfully left it out, and this indeed is the true Reason: for all the world cannot but see (notwithstanding his Shifts) that his Subject engag'd him to reckon This in the number of the *Benefits* accruing by the Coming of Jesus Christ, if he had thought it to be one. When he was enumerating of those, this could not possibly have been omitted, because by all Writers that are not *Socinians*

nians this is always put into the Catalogue of thoſe Bleſſings which we ſhare in by the Undertakings of our Bleſſed Saviour. Hence it appears how impertinent and ridiculous that is, *It was not in the place he (* meaning *me) would have it in, p.* 5. He ſhould have ſaid, it is not in the place where every one might reaſonably have look'd for it, it was not in the place where his matter neceſſarily oblig'd him to inſert it, ſo that he was both faithleſs to his Subject, and falſe to the True Cauſe: in brief, it was not in that place where if he had not been a Pupil of *Socinus*, it would certainly have been found: for no man but ſuch a one did ever deſignedly undertake the Enumeration of thoſe *Benefits* which we are partakers of by our Lord's Coming, and yet omit at the ſame time his Redeeming and Purchaſing us by his Blood.

He pretends indeed, *p.* 5. that in an other place of his book he mentions Chriſt's *reſtoring all mankind from the ſtate of death*, and *reſtoring them to life*, and *his laying down his life for an other*, as our Saviour profeſſes he did. Theſe *few* words this *Vindicator* hath pick'd up in his book ſince he wrote it. This is *all* thro' his whole Treatiſe that he hath dropt concerning that Advantage of Chriſt's

Incarnation which I was ſpeaking of: and they are general terms too, and ſuch as every *Racovian* will ſubſcribe to; for they are not backward to own that Chriſt ſome way or other (but not That before ſpecified) *reſtored us to life*, and they cannot gainſay the expreſs words of Chriſt concerning his *laying down his life for his ſheep*, *John* 10. 15. but it is well known that (notwithſtanding this) they deny the *Satisfaction* of Chriſt, and his purchaſing life and ſalvation by vertue of his Meritorious Paſſion and Death. There is not any thing that *ſounds* like this in that part of his Diſcourſe where he peculiarly made it his employment and task to let the Reader know what Advantages we reap by our Saviours aſſuming our humane nature.

But he deridingly cries out *What will become of me, that I have not mention'd* SATISFACTION? *p. 6.* I will tell you, Sir, (ſeeing you would know) what will become of you; you will ever hereafter be reckon'd by all underſtanding men an Egregious Whiffler, or in plain terms a Notorious Diſſembler. For the caſe ſtands thus, (and I doubt not but the Reader will perfectly agree with me in it) you believe Chriſt's *Satisfaction*, or you do not: if you believe there is

ſuch

ſuch a thing, and this was one of the *Advantages* we have by Chriſt's Coming, then you were falſe and treacherous in omitting it: if you believe it not, you are as falſe and hypocritical in vouching your ſelf to be no *Socinian*, ſeeing this is one known Badg of a perſon of that Character.

Let him take which of theſe ways he will, he forfeits his Truth and Integrity. Was it not enough to make uſe of the Chief *Socinian* Arguments, and to expound Texts in the *Racovian way*, and to leave out plain and direct places even in the very *Goſpels* that aſſert the Holy *Trinity*, and moreover to throw off all the Famous Teſtimonies to this doctrine in the *Apoſtolical Epiſtles*, and to balk the *Satisfaction* of Chriſt for us even when he was purpoſely telling the Reader what are the *Advantages* which flow to us from Chriſt's Coming? Was it not enough, I ſay, to do all this (which loudly proclaims him a *Socinian*) but muſt he alſo hold the world in hand that he is none? Can this Writer himſelf conſider this, and not bluſh? Who doth not wonder at his *Weakneſs*, that he ſhould manifeſtly take the part of theſe Gentlemen and yet endeavour to perſwade us that he is not of their number? But who doth not wonder more at his *Inſincerity*, that he

ſhould act thus? Muſt not this then be his Laſting Character that he hath in his Writings demonſtated himſelf to be not only a *Socinian*, but a *Falſe hearted* one?

There are other Paſſages in his book which I might produce to confirm this Character of him, but thoſe may be taken notice of at another time. At preſent let it ſuffice that I have ſhew'd that he hath not ſaid one word in his *Vindication* that clears him of this imputation. And as for his book it ſelf of the *Reaſonableneſs of Chriſtianity*, let it ſuffice to ſay that though there have been many Treatiſes concerning that Subject, yet none ever could imagine that this which he offers could poſſibly be brought under that *Title*. He ſaith ſome body is good at Conjecturing, but if a man had the beſt faculty in the world that way, it were impoſſible to gueſs and ſurmiſe that ſuch a Title ſhould be prefix'd thoſe Papers which are an Unreaſonable and Falſe Repreſentation of Chriſtianity, a Lame and Shatter'd Account of the Principles of the Goſpel, and, in ſhort, a kind of Libel againſt the New Teſtament. Finally, let it ſuffice that I have demonſtrated to the Reader that this Gentleman acts a Part in what he writes; by which he

he hath gained this, that he muſt never be believed for the future. He that is ſuch an Under-hand dealer can't be truſted: there is no heed to be given to what he ſaith.

Thus I thought my ſelf obliged to ſet before the Reader the ſtate of the Caſe between this Gentleman and my ſelf, and to give an impartial account of our Sentiments. I am ſatisfied in my Undertaking, for (whatever my defects in it otherwiſe be) I'm ſure I have aimed aright, at the vindicating the Glory of the Great Majeſty of heaven and earth. I have faithfully aſſerted our Holy Religion, and the Divinity of the Bleſſed Author and Founder of it. I have maintained the Authority and Honour of the Holy Scriptures. To the purſuing of which Glorious Deſigns I ſhall dedicate my whole life: and I hope from what I have written, and ſhall hereafter write, the World will bear me witneſs that I do ſo.

CHAP. VIII.

The Gentleman inſinuates that the Author *would repreſent every one as an* Atheiſt *that thinks not as he doth. This Calumny is baffled. He laughs at* Orthodoxy, *and cries down* Syſtems *and* Creeds. *This Indifferent Writer blames the* Au-

thor *for his* Zeal. *Is angry with him for penetrating into his Thoughts and Intentions. The Party inure themſelves to* Sophiſtry, *and yet make a ſhew of Simplicity and Plainneſs. The Gentleman's* Uneven Temper *obſerv'd. What is meant by* a known Writer of the brotherhood. *He is himſelf of an* other Fraternity. *Though he pretends to be Grave, he Scoffs and Jeers. He cannot be brought to confeſs himſef to be a Retainer to* Socinianiſm, *though he hath given ſuch evident proofs of his being one. The* Author *ſhuts up all with ſeaſonable* Advice *to him, giving him ſome account of the* Freedom *which he hath uſed towards him in the preceding Diſcourſe.*

HAving now diſpatch'd my Main Buſineſs, and found the Bill againſt the Criminal, not by *Innuendo's* but by Plain Expreſs Proof, I am at leiſure to account with him for ſome Other Paſſages in his *Vindication.* He inſinuates that I would repreſent every one as an *Atheiſt*, or a *Promoter of Atheiſm* that doth not think as I do, *doth not juſt ſay after me, p.* 1, 2. Which is a groundleſs Calumny, and might be confuted from that *Freedom* which I profeſſed, *p.* 77. even in

in that *Diſcourſe* which he excepts againſt. I have always been averſe to *Bigotiſm*, I never ſhew'd my ſelf a Dogmatizer, but always declar'd for an Ingenuous Liberty, ſuch as doth not audaciouſly encroach upon the Neceſſary and Fundamental Points of our Religion. Therefore this *Vindicator*'s wilful miſtaking of what I ſaid, thereby to repreſent me as extremely Cenſorious and Uncharitable, looks like Spleen. But I need ſay no more than this, that the Reader is convinc'd (I queſtion not) from what hath been premiſed that this Writer will ſay any thing that comes into his head. This ſeems to be natural to him every where: and he can be no more without it than a Spaniard without his Guittar.

To be *Orthodox* is a great Scandal, it ſeems, and he often objects it to me: which, as the Learned know, was the very language and idiom of the *Arrians* of old, and of that ſort of men who are ſince known by the name of *Socinians*. He ſpeaks in the very Stile of the *Old Antitrinitarians*; though it may be he will ſay he doth not know it. He publickly prides himſelf in his *Heterodoxy*, and hates even with a deadly hatred all *Catechiſms* and *Confeſſions*, all *Syſtems* and *Models*,

dels, p. 8. He laughs at *Orthodoxy*, p. 17, 20. and derides *Myſteries*, which are infallible marks of a *Racovian* Brother. And O how he grins at the *Spirit of Creed-making*? p. 18. *Vindic.* the very thoughts of which do ſo haunt him, ſo plague and torment him that he cannot reſt till it be conjured down. And here, by the way, ſeeing I have mention'd his rancour againſt *Syſtematick books and writings*, I might repreſent the *Miſery* that is coming upon all *Bookſellers* if this Gentleman and his Correſpondents go on ſucceſsfully. Here is an effectual Plot to undermine *Stationers Hall*; for all *Syſtems* and *Bodies* of Divinity, Philoſophy, *&c.* muſt be caſhier'd: whatever looks like *Syſtem* muſt not be bought or ſold. This will fall heavy on the Gentlemen of St. *Paul's Church-yard*, and other places.

This Author often finds fault with me for my *Zeal*, p. 5, 18, 37. It is likely he hath heard that when the Goſpel was heretofore read in the Churches in *Poland* (before it was *Socinianized*,) it was uſual to draw their Swords, to ſhew that they would defend it againſt all that oppoſed it. I do but draw my Pen in defence of the *Goſpel*, yea and the *Epiſtles*, and I am cenſur'd as a *Zealot* by him.

And

And it is not ſtrange, for he muſt needs declare againſt *Zeal* that is *Indifferent*. Beſides, according to this Judicious Caſuiſt there is but *One* Point of Chriſtianity that a man can be zealous for, if he would. Queen *Mary*'s Martyrs fooliſhly threw away their lives, for neither *Bonner* nor any of their Perſecutors did ſo much as deſire them to renounce this Article *Jeſus is the Meſſias:* and as for all the reſt, this Gentleman tells us that they are *not neceſſarily to be believ'd*, and conſequently not to be acknowledg'd and profeſs'd; and then who will ſhew any *Zeal* for them, eſpecially ſuch as will carry a man into the Flames?

He often talks of *my being in his boſom, and knowing his heart and thoughts*, p. 14, 15, 24. (which by the by is more than his Brethren will allow *God himſelf* to know, for *Free Acts being uncertain they can't be certainly underſtood by God* (as the Gentleman whom I ſhall ſpeak a word with anon tells us.) This ſort of Talk argues that he is much troubled that I have penetrated into his *Thoughts*, and have diſcovered to the world what his Intention and Deſign is. And yet he intimates alſo by this way of ſpeaking that it is an Impoſſible thing to do this. How

im-

impoſſible then is it for himſelf *to know his heart?* for this is a certain Maxim, It is the Puniſhment of a Diſſembler to deceive himſelf, for his endeavouring to do ſo to others. I wiſh this Writer would conſider of it, and learn for the future to be free, open and fair, and then others (as well as himſelf) would have a window into his breaſt, and ſee that which they are ſorry they find no appearance of now.

And I wiſh this were not too common a fault of the Party, at leaſt of many of them. They inure themſelves to Sophiſtry, Cunning, and Artifice, when they either interpret Texts, or Argue in favour of their Darling Opinions. They then too palpably impoſe upon other mens minds, as well as upon their own. And yet at the ſame time they pretend to great Simplicity and honeſt dealing. Thus you find them applauding themſelves in their late Prints: * *the Unitarians* (ſay they of themſelves) *are plain fellows, and have Countrey Conſciences, and do not like juggling.* You Gentlemen of the *City*, look to it: theſe *Unitarians*, theſe *Socinians* have a very bad opinion of you, for here they would have it believ'd that *City-Conſciences* are falſe and per-

* The Trinitarian Scheme of Religion, *page* 21.

perfidious, deceitful and juggling. It is a courſe Complement, and Ruſtick enough which theſe *Plain Fellows* put upon you. It is not the firſt time they have ſtruck at you: *London* muſt be diſciplin'd by *Racovia*. And the *Vindicator* is one of theſe *Plain Fellows*, for as he hath ſhew'd himſelf an *Unitarian*, ſo he makes it appear that he hath a *Country-Conſcience* in the ſenſe that theſe men ultimately mean it in, *viz.* a knack of Cheating in a Ruſtical plain way, as when he pretends to make a Religion for the *Rabble*, an *Eaſie Plain Religion*, a *Creed with One Article*, and no more; pretending thereby to gratifie *them*, but under hand ſubverting *Chriſtianity*.

Nor have I yet done with him. I find him to be a Man of a very Uneven Temper: ſometimes he is very Low and Whining, and will be *asking pardon*, and *deſiring me*,&c at other times he is Imperious and Magiſterial, and *requires me*,&c. Sometimes he talks very demurely, as about being *in earneſt*, *p.* 9. *being ſerious and grave*, *p.* 24, 25. and in a Pedantick Humour he undertakes to cenſure and correct my *Stile*, *p.* 24. But this fit of Gravity doth not laſt long; he every where ſhews himſelf Light and Freakiſh,

Iro-

Ironical and Abuſive as far as he is able, and nibbles at Wit according to his mean Talent. He inveighs forſooth againſt *Declamatory Rhetorick, Wit and Jeſt*, &c. *p.* 24. *Vindic.* and yet at the ſame time is Wanton and Frolick, Starting any thing to ſport himſelf with. In that very place before mention'd where he ſeems to put on his Gravity, he hath not forgot *the Merry time of Rope-dancing and Puppet-Plays*, at which he was good in the days of yore. It is likely he had been a little before conducting ſome of his Young Brood to *Bartholomew Fair*, and thence this precious idea came into his head.

Without doubt he thought he was not a little Ingenious in that waggiſh expreſſion, *p.* 6. *a Known Writer of the brotherhood:* which is meant of the Brethren of the Clergy who have writ againſt the *Socinian* Cauſe, the ſame with the *Popular Authorities* and *Frightful Names* which he ſpeaks of, *p.* 23. The profeſſed Divines of *England* you muſt know are but a pitiful ſort of folks with this great *Racovian Rabbi*. He tells us plainly that he is not mindful of what *the Generality of Divines declare for*, *p.* 22. He labours ſo concernedly to engratiate himſelf with the *Mob*, the *Multitude* (which he ſo often

ten talks of) that he hath no regard to theſe. *The generality of the Rabble* are more conſiderable with him than *the generality of Divines, the Writers of the brotherhood.* Though truly a Wiſe Man that hears any one judg thus, will think he deſerves as well to be rewarded with a pair of Ears of the largeſt ſize as *he* did who judg'd on *Pan*'s ſide againſt *Apollo.* But there is more yet in this term of *brotherhood* than this, for here it is implied (and his thoughts may be ſuppos'd to be upon it when he wrote) that he himſelf is a Writer of an *Other Fraternity*; and truly this Stile is very proper, for the men of that Party (as 'tis well known) have labour'd to ſignalize themſelves (in the Writings that they have publiſh'd) by the Title of *Brethren.* It is agreed then; we will for the future take him for a *Polonian Brother.* And I ask the Reader whether this *Brother* be not of kin to the Order of *Friers* in *Italy* who were call'd *Fratres Ignorantiæ, viz.* becauſe, they profeſſed to teach the people as little as poſſibly they could, as ſuppoſe *One Article of Religion*, and no more.

I might proceed further, and ſhew that this Author, as Demure and Grave as he would ſometimes ſeem to be, can

ſcoff

ſcoff at the Matters of Faith contain'd in the Apoſtles *Epiſtles*, *p.* 18. *l.* 4. *&c.* To coakſe the *Mob* he prophanely brings in that place of Scripture, *Have any of the Rulers believ'd in him?* *p.* 33. Ridiculouſly and Irreligiouſly he pretends that *I prefer what he ſaith to me to what is offer'd to me from the Word of God*, *p.* 25. What is there that this Gentleman will not turn into Ridicule or Falſity? What is there that he will not take hold of to be Sportive and Gameſome? We may further ſee how Counterfeit his *Gravity* is whilſt he condemns *frothy and light diſcourſes*, *p.* 26. *Vindic.* and yet in many pages together moſt irreverently treats a great part of the *Apoſtolical Writings*, and throws aſide the Main Articles of Religion as unneceſſary. From all which it is clear that he contradicts and oppoſes himſelf. Whence by the by we may gather that when he ſaith he is *no Socinian*, we muſt take his meaning to be that *he is one*, for he is made up of Contradictions. I obſerved before that the *Diſſenting Miniſters confeſs'd to him* (if you will believe * him) *that they underſtood not the difference in debate among them:* but this Gentleman can't be brought to *confeſs* any thing, he will

* Reaſonableneſs of Chriſtianity, *p.* 303.

will not own that he is *a Writer of the brotherhood.* No: there is ſome great Reaſon (if it may be call'd ſo) for this, that he would not be thought to be of *Sozzo*'s ſide: though the Marks and Tokens are ſo plain that he may be apprehended without a Hue and Crie.

Come, Good Sir, do not act a part any longer: They have been deſirous to put you upon ſervice, and you were as willing to be employ'd in it: but now at laſt Confeſs it. Appear no more in Maſquerade: away with this Mummery, and ſhew your ſelf what you are. You have let the world ſee (and ſo far we are beholding to you) that *Socinian* is a Reproachful Title; that any one may gather from your being ſo backward to own it. You would never have taken ſo much pains to ſhift off this Character if it were not a very Scandalous One. Throw off your Vizour then, and ſpeak out like a Man. Be free and ingenuous, and diſſemble not with Heaven as well as Men. I have, Sir, been very free with you, which you may impute to your not being ſo with your ſelf. You know the Rule among the Men of Art, The Heart is known by the Pulſe. I have made bold to uſurp upon the Faculty, I have been

feel-

feeling your Pulſe, and I have found that it ſtrongly beats after the *Racovian* tone. This I have told you with ſome plaineſs, and you are obliged to me for repreſenting you to your ſelf. I know you did not expect an Aſſault, for it was your ſelf (however you apply it to me) that was thought to be one of * *the moſt Priviledged ſort of men*. But, Sir, in the Reign of Truth *Protections* are not of any uſe. It is a laudable way ſometimes to fight the Enemy in his Trenches. There are ſome Criminals that muſt be ſnatch'd from the horns of the Altar, eſpecially when they injure the Altar it ſelf, when they abuſe that which is Holy, and trample upon our Sacred Faith and Religion.

To conclude, I have ſaid nothing out of prejudice or diſguſt, much leſs out of bitterneſs and ill will, for I am in Entire Charity with you, and the more ſo becauſe I have ſpoken ſo freely. If you complain now (as you did before) that you are *hardly dealt with*, I have only this to ſay, A Plain Down-right Adverſary might perhaps have met with another uſage, but ſuch a Stubborn Diſſembler could not expect *fairer quarter*.

A

* Vindic *p.* 20.

A

Brief REPLY

To Another

SOCINIAN Writer,

Whoſe Cavils bear this Title,

[The Exceptions of Mr. *Edwards* in his *Cauſes of Atheiſm* againſt the *Reaſonableneſs of Chriſtianity*, &c. Examin'd.]

A

Brief REPLY

To another

SOCINIAN Author.

THERE came lately to my hand this Writer's Sheets in the true *Racovian Print*: but I having been so large upon the *Vindicator*, this *Double-Column'd* Gentleman, who pretends to be an *Examinator*, cannot expect I should spend much time about him. In the first place we are to observe that he most humbly and reverentially *dedicates* his Papers to the New Patron of the Cause, and takes upon him the Defence of what he hath said in his *Reasonableness of Christianity*. He highly applauds him for his being so serviceable to the *Socinian* and *Antitrinitarian* Interest. And it is part of his Panegyrick that *he hath happily provided for the quiet and satisfaction of the minds of the honest*

multitude, *p.* 3. That is, he hath not troubled and molested them (as some have done with propounding Several Articles of Christian Belief) but hath told them that *One* is enough for them, and bids them rest contented with that, like good honest Ignorant Souls. Thus *he hath provided* (but how *happily* let the Reader judg) *for their quiet and satisfaction.* But though the *Examinator* heaps great Commendations on the *Vindicator*, yet he professes it (you'll believe him, you may) that *he knows him not*, *p* 4. Only at a venture he takes his part, he now being become one of the *Brotherhood*, and may prove a very Substantial Tool and Engine in the great Work they are now about, *viz.* the subverting of our Saviour's *Divinity*, the laying aside the *Apostolical Epistles*, the shutting out the *Necessary Matters of Faith* contain'd in them, and the setting up and idolizing of *One Article*, with defiance of all the rest as any ways Necessary to be believ'd. This is the New *DIANA* that is set up by our *Ephesians*, especially by their late *Demetrius*.

Then he hath a fling at my *Booksellers*, *p.* 5. wherein he follows the steps of the *Vindicator*, *p.* 37. And in this and other things

things they jump, which diſcovers their Correſpondence, though he had but juſt before ſaid *he knew him not*. And ſo this gives us an account of the truth of what the *Vindicator* ſaid, that *he knew not that the Socinians interpreted ſuch and ſuch Texts after ſuch a manner*. This is ſaid to impoſe upon the world, and make them believe that he and the *Racovians* have not been Confederates. But he confutes this in another place, where he owns that he hath particular knowledg of that Gentleman, and knew the circumſtances of his Life, *p.* 13. *Col.* 2. for he could not ſay of him that *he overcame the prejudices of Education* unleſs he had been acquainted with his Education and manner of life. And if this is *the Gentleman of no ordinary judgment*, from whom he ſaith *he hath ſeen a Letter*, &c. *p.* 17. Here ſtill you ſee is Juggling and ſleight of hand, and it is natural and proper it ſeems to the Party. And further to ſhew their Conferring of Notes together, it might be obſerv'd that both agree to ſay that what I write was writ in *haſt* and in a *fit*, *Examin. p.* 5. *Vindicat. p.* 19. And let it be ſo, if they will, for thence it will appear that a man need not take up much time to confute either the *Vindicator* or this Gentleman.

But what is this that he hath to ſay of my *Bookſellers?* Some great matter without doubt. *He put me upon making Exceptions againſt that Treatiſe, that ſo the ſale of his own Tract might be the more promoted,* p. 5. The Reader may gueſs from this what is their own Trade; they and their Bookſellers joyntly club to cheat the poor bulk of mankind. That is their practice we may learn from their faſtning it upon others. Any man may ſee that the *Rationaliſt* went ſnips with his *Pater-Noſter-Men*, they fully underſtood one another, as appears from their not denying him to be the Author of the *Reaſonableneſs of Chriſtianity*, &c. all the time it was in the Preſs: but when they ſaw the Sale of it was not according to their High Expectations, they, to buoy up the Gentleman's Credit, began to diſown him to be the Author. This was done by the two *Shrinemen* that before cried aloud for *Diana*. Now then, I think it appears at laſt that theſe people are extremely beholding to *my Bookſellers* if they did any ſuch thing as they ſurmiſe, for by this means the ſale of *their Book* was promoted.

After the *Bookſellers*, I muſt be taken to task by the Reverend *Examinator*, who having

having flutter'd a little about the *formal words* which I had ſaid were to be found in *the Reaſonableneſs of Chriſtianity* (which no Creature that hath once read it will once doubt of) he fixes on this (*p.* 5.) as the *Vindicator*'s true ſenſe, yea his own words, *that all that was to be believed for juſtification, or to make a man a Chriſtian, by him that did already believe in, and worſhip one True God, maker of heaven and earth, was no more than this Single Propoſition, that Jeſus of Nazareth was the Chriſt or the Meſſias.* This man makes a Miſerable Entrance to his work, for though he ſaith theſe are the Vindicator's words (for thus he brings them in, *It is true he ſaith*) yet no man alive can find them in his book: and he knew this himſelf, elſe he would have ſet down the page, as we find him paging it afterwards. What ſhall we ſay then to ſuch men as theſe who will vouch any thing? They can be truſted with no book, no not with one of their own Tribe, for we ſee here that this Writer's ſtile is, *he ſaith*, and yet this Expreſs *Saying* no where occurs in the book he refers to. And here by the way, we may obſerve the bold Partiality of this Writer; he (as well as the *Vindicator*, *p.* 38.) would charge me

with not quoting the *formal words* which are in the *Reasonableness of Christianity*, whilest he is not sensible of his plain misquoting the same Author. Yet here we may observe this, that it is but a *Single Proposition* (and no more) which is to be believ'd, to make a man a Christian. This is the sense of the *Vindicator*'s friend, thus he understands him; and so indeed every one must, and yet it may be remembred that the Vindicator himself would evade this, and pretends that he means more than a Single Proposition or Article.

Now next let us see how this *Examinator* licks over the *Vindicator*'s Article, and tells us that the belief of *Jesus*'s being the *Messias comprehends* and *implies several other things*, p. 3. Here he sweats to bring off his Brother handsomly and with credit by letting us know that his Bold Assertion which runs through his whole book is to be *qualified* after this manner, 1. *All synonymous expressions*, &c. and so he sets them down one, two and three. But I ask him this Question (and let the Reader be pleas'd to observe the issue of it) Why did not the Gentleman himself make use of these *Qualifications* when he vented the Proposition, and insisted upon it in the

the bulk of his book, yea why did he not mention theſe *Qualifications* in his *Anſwer* to my Exceptions againſt his book? He knew what he had aſſerted, and he defends (as well he can) his doing ſo, but you will find in no part of his *Vindication* that he betakes himſelf to theſe *Evaſions*, though he hath enough of Others of a different ſort. How then come you, Mr. *Examinator*, to invent theſe things for him? Do you not hereby proclaim to the world that you will put off the Reader with any idle and groundleſs Conceit of your own?

When he repeats my words, *p.* 6, 7. wherein I took notice of the Gentleman's *willful omitting of plain and obvious paſſages in the Evangeliſts* (out of whoſe Writings he had drawn a Whole Article) *which contain the belief of the Holy Trinity*, he ſaith not a word to excuſe his *Omiſſion*, but by his ſilence (for he would have ſpoken without doubt if he had had any thing to ſay in his Friends defence) he owns it to be wilful and blameable. Only he comes with the Trite and Common Anſwer of the Party to thoſe Texts; but before he enters upon the Second of them, *viz. John* 1. 1. he declares *there is no ſuch Text in the whole Bible*, *p.* 9. He ſaid

said rightly that *he was bold to say it*, for a man shall scarcely hear a more Audacious word, though 'tis true he endeavours to mollifie it with an *if*.

As to what he saith about my taking notice of the Gentleman's slighting the *Epistolary Writings*, I have fully answered it in the foregoing Papers, and therefore shall add no more here.

He proceeds next to those *Socinan Authors*, whose undue Notions concerning *God* I glanc'd upon. The Author of *the Considerations*, &c. in reply to the Right Reverend Bishop who had from the notion of *God's Eternity* inferr'd that he was *Self-existent* or *from himself*, hath these words, *What makes him (viz.* the Bishop) *say, God must be from himself, or self-originated? for then he must be before he was*, which this Writer concludes to be a Contradiction. Therefore he would make this Conclusion that God's *Self-existence* is a Contradiction. I know it will be pretended that this is the Consequence only of the Bishops Notion of *Eternity*, but it is plain that that Writer makes use of this Arguing to shake the belief of the *Eternity* and *Self-Existence* of the Allmighty, and that will appear from what he further adds in way of Exception to what that Reve-

Reverend Perſon ſaith afterwards concerning God's Eternity. This *Examinator* talks of a *falſe notion of Self-exiſtence*, but doth not ſay what it is. If I have miſtaken the *Conſiderer*, let him write plainer another time.

As to the *Examinator*'s queſtion, How the *Second* and *Third Perſons* can be *Self-exiſtent*? I anſwer, They are Self-exiſtent as they are eternally from the Self-ſame Deity. Though according to the *Nicene* Creed Chriſt be *God of God*, yet that doth not infring his *Self-Exiſtence*, becauſe thoſe words are not ſpoken of the *Eſſence* of Chriſt which is common to him with his *Father*, but of his *Perſonality*. He being the ſame with the *Father* as to the former hath his Exiſtence of himſelf; but differing from the *Father* as to the latter, he is rightly ſaid to be *from him*, or *of him* as he is the Second Perſon in the Trinity. This is eaſily reconciled with what he ſaith an Other Biſhop aſſerts, if this *Unitarian* hath not a mind to quarrel.

In the next Paragraph he is quite nonpluſs'd, for I had charg'd the *Socinian* Authors with their denial of *God's foreknowing future Contingencies*, and conſequently denying the *Omniſcience* of God, which

is

is an inſeparable Attribute of the Deity; and he having nothing to reply to the purpoſe, firſt tells us *he is not concern'd in it*, *p.* 18, whereas every one knows that he being one of the Party is concern'd. Secondly, aſſoon as he had as it were renounced the *Socinian* doctrine by ſaying he was not Concern'd in it, he preſently owns it for Truth, as thoſe words import, *p.* 18.--- *to deny his foreknowledg of the certainty of that which is not certain*, &c. which is as much as to ſay that there are ſome things that are Uncertain and therefore Unknowable, and theſe God can have no knowledg of. And yet thirdly, he would ſeem to hint that *it is a diſhonourable thing to God* (thoſe are his words) that he ſhould not have a foreſight of theſe things. Thus Confuſed is our Author, which ſhews he is not fit to be an *Examiner* of other mens Writings, when he can't write Conſiſtently himſelf, but in three or four lines hath as many Blunders.

In the next words and what follows he perfectly gives up the Cauſe, *p.* 18. for I had laid this to the charge of the *Racovians* that they denied the *Immenſity* or *Omnipreſence* of God, which is a Property or Perfection never to be disjoyn'd from

from the Deity; whereupon he tamely acknowledges that *Crellius* and the reſt of the Fraternity are of this perſwaſion. Only, becauſe the Gentleman muſt be wagging his tongue, he gives us a ſcrap out of a *Latin Poet*, and juſt names a *Greek Father*, who never ſaid any thing to that matter, and ſo we are rid of them.

But he comes on again, and goes off aſſoon, for he barely mentions the *Spirituality* of God, which I had aſſerted to be another Divine Excellency: and it is ſuch an Attribute of God that we can't conceive of him without it, and therefore it is made the ſhort and comprehenſive Definition of him that *he is a Spirit*, *John* 4. 24. In my Diſcourſe which this *Examinator* calls in queſtion I took notice that the *Socinians* denied this Property of the Deity, which I juſtly tax'd as an *Atheiſtick Tang*: and I think it was a mild term, for it is a Rank Sign of a great tendency to Atheiſm to deny that God is a *Spirit*, *i. e.* an Immaterial Incorporeal Being. But our preſent Author reſolves himſelf into the opinion of thoſe *modeſt Divines* (who by their Bluſhing can be no other than *Socinus*'s Scholars) who determine nothing about the Point; which is as much as to ſay, he and they de-

deny it. But you must know they are now a little upon their Credit: this Gentleman (who speaks in the name of the rest) had before given up the *Immensity* and *Omniscience* of God, and therefore it is high time now to be upon the Reserve, and to pause a little, that the world may not see that they reject All those Properties of the Deity which I mention'd. But notwithstanding this cunning practice of theirs, the world may see, yea, it cannot but plainly see that they deny every one of these Divine Attributes more or less, and this particularly which I mention'd last, *viz.* that *God is a Spirit* properly so call'd. For whereas I quoted *Socinus* and *Crellius* (their Grand Patriots) to prove this denial, this Writer takes no notice of my doing so, which lets us see that the opinion of those Great Masters is humbly submitted to by all the rest.

So now I hope the Reader is convinc'd that I was not *Unjust* to the *Socinians*, that I did not *highly injure* them (as they have cried out) when I charg'd them with *Atheism* or a *Strong Tendency* to it in some Points. I tax'd them with denying these four Attributes, the *Self-Existence*, the *Omniscience*, the *Omnipotence*, the

the *Spirituality of God*, and lo! this profeſſed Son of *Socinus* (who was choſen out with great deliberation and judgment without doubt from the reſt of his brethren to undertake the Cauſe, to refute what I had alledg'd againſt them, and who queſtionleſs hath ſaid all that he could in the Caſe) lo! I ſay, this profeſſed and *known Writer of the Brotherhood* confirms and ratifies what I have laid to their charge. For he produces the words out of their own Author which I referr'd to, whence it appears that he had a mind to diſtort the Right Reverend Biſhop of *Worceſter*'s words, and to argue againſt the *Self-Exiſtence* of God. This *Examinator* without any more ado rejects the Second and third Attributes, and by his boggling at the fourth we know what muſt be the fate of that. Thus he and his fellow-Criminals being conſcious to the truth and Juſtice of the Charge, confeſs themſelves *Guilty*. They are ſo far from clearing themſelves of the Imputation and Enditement that they Aggravate it. I leave the Reader to give the *Sentence*. They deſerve a Severe one at his hands, but I deſire him to be Merciful for the ſake of our Lord JESUS CHRIST, who forgave and pray'd for his

his greateſt Oppoſers. May the All-Merciful God forgive them, and enlighten their minds, that they may be convinc'd of their Errors, and heartily renounce them. The Lord *give them Repentance to the acknowledging of the truth, that they may recover themſelves out of the ſnare of the devil.*

Then he runs to their *Common Place*, which hath help'd to fill up their papers many a time, and he thinks he doth great feats. But he only epitomizes *Crellius de Uno Deo Patre*, and offers a great many Texts *which have been anſwered a hundred times*, as he (but untruly) ſaith on another occaſion, *p.* 8. This takes up 18 or 19 whole Pages: and why? Becauſe this coſts him nothing, he borrows it all (and he might have borrow'd a great deal more) from the ſame Author. Here he can afford to be very long and large, but when he undertakes the *Examination* of what I had *particularly objected* againſt the *Socinians*, he is like the dog at *Nilus*, he is preſently gone: he is not furniſh'd with any Anſwer that he dares inſiſt upon, or truſt to.

Next, I will obſerve to the Reader that this Author meddles not with my *Argument* which I drew from their own

pro-

Profeſſed Principle, viz. that *nothing is to be believed but what is exactly adjuſted to Reaſon*, and thence prov'd that upon the ſame account that they reject the doctrine of the Holy *Trinity* they may likewiſe quit the belief of a *Deity*. This I enlarg'd upon in ſeven pages together, it being (as I then conceiv'd, and am more confirm'd in it ſince) an Unanſwerable Proof of what I laid to their Charge. He only grazes on it a little, *p.* 19. but wheels off preſently, and fixes upon that ſubject before mentioned, *God's Unity*, becauſe he knew where to have enough of it, but did not know how to take off the force of that *Argument* which I propounded and inſiſted upon.

In the next place he will turn *Critick*, and ſee whether he can thrive in this employment, ſeeing he hath ſo ill ſucceſs in his former attempts. His nice palate diſguſts the word *birth*, as applyed to *Adam*, *p.* 38. but thereby he only ſhews his want of skill in the Denotation of words. He is ſo poor a Dabbler in *Grammer* and *Criticiſm* that he knows not that by the Hebrew *jalad*, and the *Greek* γένος and γενᾶς, and the Latin *naſci*, and accordingly our Engliſh [*to be born*] are

ſignified in a *general* way the *Origin*, *Riſe*, or *Beginning* of things or perſons, and conſequently *Birth* or *Nativity* is not to be taken always in the Vulgar Senſe. He might have read in *Genethliack* Writers that the word is applied even to *Cities* and *Houſes*. But I need not go ſo far to defend the Expreſſion. The uſe of it, and that in the very way that I have applied it, is to be found in Scripture: *Art thou the firſt man that was born? Job* 15. 7. Or we may read it, if we pleaſe, more exactly according to the Original, *Art thou born as the firſt man, or Adam, i. e.* (as the Context will ſhew it) art thou as underſtanding as the man that was *firſt born*, *viz.* as our Firſt Parent *Adam*? By reaſon of this *birth Adam* is call'd *the ſon of God*, *Luk.* 3. 38. Whence the *Socinians* would gather that *Chriſt* hath that name upon the like account, becauſe of his Extraordinary *Original*, becauſe of his Miraculous *Birth*. Thus we have found that this Gentleman is ignorant of the true meaning of words in *Common Authors*, that he doth not know the acception of them in *Holy Scripture*, nay that he doth not know what his *own Authors* ſay, which evinces him to be triply a *Blunderer*, and that

that he deſerves no more to be call'd an *Examinator*.

Then he thinks he doth mighty things, *p.* 39. by quoting *Limborch* a very Learned Foreigner (a *Syſtem-maker*, for he hath compiled a Large *Syſtem* of Divinity, though he gives it another Name; and why then doth this Gentleman talk ſo reproachfully of *Syſtems*? *p.* 44. *&c.*) but this his Author is a *Second Epiſcopius*; and therefore it was wiſely done to bring him in to tell us what are the *Fundamentals* of Religion.

But it was more cunningly done in the next Paragraph to fetch in the *Sixth Article* of the *Church of England* in favour of the *Vindicator*'s Conceit. Surely this his Patron, at whoſe feet he lays his Papers, will give him little thanks for this, for he jeers him rather than defends his Cauſe. Thus though they are agreed, and underſtand one another ſo far as to Impoſe upon the world, yet they cannot (and never will) agree to ſpeak Truth. And indeed this Worthy Writer foreſignified ſomething of this nature. He is a *boding* ſort of man, you may perceive, for thus he ſpeaks in his Humble Dedicatory to the Vindicator, *If I have miſtaken your ſenſe, or uſed weak reaſonings in your de-*

fence (and behold! here he doth both) *I crave your pardon.* And ſo you may, and I will tell you for your comfort, he will ſoon forgive you, for he knows that your heart is right, *i.e.* for the Good Cauſe, and therefore a little Miſtaking of him out of weakneſs is pardonable.

Then he hales in *Mr. Chillingworth* by head and ſhoulders, *p.* 40. pronouncing him very definitively *the ableſt defender of the Religion of Proteſtants that the Church ever had*; which is too high a Character for him, though he was a perſon of Great Parts and Learning. Why muſt he be ſaid to be *the Ableſt Defender* when we can name ſo many Eminent Writers in other Countreys that have perform'd this task? Or, if he means the *Church of England*, why muſt he have the abſolute Preference to Others that we can name here, eſpecially that Great Ornament and Glory of our Church, whom I had occaſion to mention before, who hath ſo Learnedly defended the *Religion of Proteſtants*? I, but he writ againſt *Crellius*, and therefore he muſt not be the *Ableſt Defender*. Again, there is a reaſon well known to the world why Mr. *Chillingworth* hath

the

the *Preheminence* in the opinion of this Writer and his Confederates, but of that at ſome other time perhaps. Let us now go on, and ſee what this Gentleman gets by his producing of Mr. *Chillingworth*; and it is no other than this, a plain confutation of the *Vindicator*'s Project concerning the reducing of Religion to a Point, and no more. For theſe are that Worthy Man's words, *The Bible, the Bible, I ſay the Bible only is the Religion of Proteſtants.* And I ſay ſo too, but this Gentleman and the Author of *the Reaſonableneſs of Chriſtianity* are of another opinion, for according to them it is not the *Bible*, but a very *Small Portion* of it that is the *Religion of Proteſtants.* They acknowledg that Some few Verſes in ſeveral Chapters of the *Four Evangeliſts* and the *Acts* are matter of Faith or Religion, but they do not cry *the Bible, the Bible, the Bible*, they do not think that All and Every one of the Fundamental Truths in the Whole Scripture are the neceſſary matter of our Belief. Thus I think this Reverend Scribe might have ſpared the quoting of Mr. *Chillingworth*, unleſs he delights in confuting himſelf and his New Convert.

Afterwards he nibbles at ſome other paſſages in my Diſcourſe, but flies off into Impertinencies. Only one thing I meet with that is very Remarkable, and I requeſt the Reader to attend to it. *There are* (ſaith he) *ſome that of Deiſts have been reconciled to the Chriſtian faith by the Unitarian books, and have profeſs'd much ſatisfaction therein*, p. 42. You may perceive that they are making of *Proſelytes* as faſt as they can, and among the reſt ſome *Deiſts* come in to them, and ſo (as the Apoſtle ſpeaks of Seducers and thoſe that are Seduced, 2 *Pet.* 2. 20.) *the latter end is worſe with them than the beginning*: for whereas before they owned a *Natural Religion*, now they become guilty of perverting and prophaning a *Revealed* one. They are ſo far from being *reconciled to the Chriſtian Faith*, that they oppoſe and contradict it, and even defie the *Main Articles* of this Religion which is owing to Divine Revelation. Such Converts as theſe have no reaſon to *profeſs much ſatisfaction in the Unitarian books*, unleſs Corrupting the Chriſtian faith be to be choſen before plain *Theiſm*. To ſpeak the plain truth (and it is the deſign of theſe Papers to do ſo) and that which every Thinking

ing and Conſidering Man cannot but diſcern, the *Socinians* are but the Journeymen of the *Deiſts*, and they are ſet on work by them, for theſe latter hope to compaſs their Deſign, which is to impair the Credit of the *Chriſtian Religion* and of thoſe *Inſpired Writings* which give us an account of it, they hope (I ſay) effectually to compaſs this deſign by the help of ſuch Good Inſtruments as they find the *Socianiz'd* Men to be. You ſee then what ground this Gentleman hath to think that the *Deiſts* are Proſelytes to the *Unitarians*.

Then he proceeds to make a long harangue about the *Obſcurity of Syſtematical Fundamentals*, *p.* 44. &c. but never was poor Creature ſo bewildred as he is. Only he happily lights upon the *Quakers*, *p.* 44, 45. where it is worth obſerving that the man doth not know his Friends from his Foes, nor theſe from them. He rails againſt this ſort of men (who he ſaith would be counted *the only People of God*) and yet it is certain that they are his brethren-*Socinians*. *They utterly diſown the Scripture as the Rule of Faith*, he ſaith: and doth not our late *Socinian* Writer ſymbolize with them when he declares that the Divine Truths con-

tained in the *Epistles* of the Holy Apostles (which are a considerable part of *Scripture*) are not the Necessary matter of Faith? He complains that *the Quakers turn the Gospel into an Allegory*; but the forementionʼd Author doth much worse, for he represents the greatest Part of the Gospel-discoveries as Superfluous and Needless. In giving us the farther Character of the *Quakers*, he in lively colours represents the *Socinians*, for these are his words concerning them, *Retaining still the words wherein the Christian Faith is expressed, though in an Equivocal Sense, they have made a shift to be reputed generally Christians.* Certainly there could not be a better Pourtraiture of the *Racovian* Writers, for it is known that they are crafty and sophistical, and quote Scripture only to pervert it. They acknowledg *Christ* to be *God*, and an *Expiatory Sacrifice*, but they mean it *Equivocally*; they quit the true *sense* of Scripture though they retain the *words*, and by reason of this latter *have made a shift* (as this Author speaks) *to pass for Christians.* These men (whatever some few *English* Writers of the *Racovian* way hold of late) exactly side with the *Quakers* in crying down of *Water-Baptism* (for so they

they both call it in deriſion.) In the Grand Point of the *Trinity* they both concur, *i. e.* to reject it, witneſs *W. Pen's Sandy Foundation*, by which he means the doctrine of the *Bleſſed Trinity*. In a quibbling manner, wherein he ſhews both his Ignorance and Blaſphemy, he thus ſpeaks, * *If God, as the Scriptures teſtifie, hath never been declared or believed but as the* HOLY ONE, *then it will follow that God is not an* HOLY THREE. *Neither can this receive the leaſt prejudice from that frequent, but impertinent diſtinction, that he is One in Subſtance, but Three in Perſons or Subſiſtencies.* To which all *Socinus's* followers ſay *Amen*. The ſame Gentleman derides the doctrine of *Satisfaction*, and ſcoffingly calls the Aſſerters of it † *Satisfactioniſts*: and who knows not that *Tranſylvania* agrees here with *Penſylvania*? *The Man that ſuffer'd at Jeruſalem* is the *Socinian* as well as the *Quakers Stile*: And generally as to the main things that relate to our *Saviour*, they perfectly accord, *viz.* in making nothing of them. If *Quakeriſm* then *be no Chriſtianity*, as this our Writer reports

* *W. Pen's* Sandy Foundation. *p.* 12. † Sandy Foundat. ibid.

ports it in the ſame place, then we may with much more reaſon conclude that *Socinianiſm is none.* By this it appears that *Socinus* and *Fox* are well met, and that they are very Loving Friends. But they muſt ſeem to diſagree, as here in this Gentleman's Papers.

Laſtly, let us ſee the wonderful hand of God in ſuffering this Unthoughtful Writer to produce *a Paper written by a Jeſuite in the late Reign, entituled an Addreſs*, &c. And in this Addreſs, he ſaith, *he goes about to ſhew that the Scriptures commonly alledg'd for the Trinity, admit of another ſenſe. He goes the ſame way in the Article of the Incarnation.* What! had he not enough of the *Quaker* but he muſt bring in the *Jeſuite*? And muſt he tell the world that the *Jeſuitical* Writers take the part of the *Socinians*? muſt he publickly give notice that they both carry on the ſame work, and joyntly conſpire to pervert the *Scriptures* in order to it? For the credit of the Cauſe, it had been better to have placed this under a former head, and to have told the Reader that ſome *Jeſuites* (as well as ſome *Deiſts*) are *Converts* to *Socinianiſm.* But he hath blurted it out that *Ignatius Loyola* and *Fauſtus Socinus* were of kin. Surely

ly this Author must not be employ'd any more to write in defence of the Cause. He must be no longer a *Double-Column'd* Writer: they must look out for a man that is not so Open-hearted, one that can handle his Weapon with more Cunning, for this man hath stabb'd his own Cause.

But because this Writer in the beginning and towards the end of his Papers is pleas'd to use some words of Deference and Respect, I will not be backward to return his Civility in the same kind by letting him know that I suppose him to be a *Person of Ingenuity and Learning* (only I wish he had *shew'd* it in his late Undertaking) and that *I would not have made opposition to him in any other Points* but These which are the Foundation, Basis and Ground-work of *Christianity*, and the very Life and Soul of our *Religion*, and therefore none is to be permitted to treat them *irreverently* and *scoffingly*, as he and his Associates have lately done. But I entertain some hope that this Unsavoury *Tang* will wear off in time.

And thus I have finished both my *Replies* to the Gentlemen's Writings against me: and I have wholly confined my

self

ſelf to theſe, and not ventured to gueſs at their Perſons, or make any Reflections of that kind, for that is a thing which I abhor. Nay, though the *Vindicator* by his reflecting upon my *Degree*, *p.* 24. and 36. and *Calling*, *p.* 36, and before, *p.* 26, and before that, *p.* 9. had given me occaſion to enquire into his Quality and Character, yet I purpoſely forbore to meddle with any ſuch Conſiderations. And ſo as to the *Examinator*, I could eaſily have traced his Perſon and Station, and offer'd ſome Remarks upon either, but I made it not my buſineſs to obſerve Who they were that wrote, but what they had written. And it was neceſſary to do this latter with ſome Salt and Keenneſs, that the levity of their Arguments might be the better expoſed, and that I might in a lawful and innocent way retaliate that Liberty which they had taken. And indeed the *Socinian* Gentlemen muſt ſhew themſelves very Diſingenuous (which I will not preſume of them) if they be diſſatisfied with me for my Freedom of diſcourſe, when in all their Writings they profeſs to uſe it. And it is plain that they make uſe of it: for who

who ſees not that * they have been very ſharp upon ſome of the moſt Eminent and Venerable Perſons of our Church? They have handled the late Archbiſhop and ſome of his Reverend Brethren (who in their Writings ſhewed their diſlike of the *Socinian* doctrines) with no exceſs of Reſpect: And they repreſent them and the whole Clergy as Mercenary, Timerous, and Falſe hearted: They would perſwade the world that the doctrine of the *Trinity* is defended by them merely becauſe they are bribed or forced to it. And others of their Writers have been very ſevere upon the *Trinitarians* in their late Prints. And therefore with good reaſon ſome of Theſe have been free with them again, eſpecially that Worthy Perſon who undertook the Defence of the *Archbiſhop* and the *Biſhop of Worceſter*, and hath with great Vivacity and Sharpneſs reflected on the *Socinian* Errors, and with as great Solidity and Compoſedneſs eſtabliſh'd the contrary Truths, and hath not ſpared that

* Conſiderations on the Explications of the doctrine of the Trinity.

that Socinian Author whom he grapples with, no not in the leaſt. I ſuppoſe none will grudg *me* that Freedom which this Gentleman and others have taken in their *Replies* to the *Racovian* Writers, eſpecially ſeeing I have not (as I conceive) made ill uſe of it. But of that let the Reader judg.

F I N I S.

BOOKS written by the Reverend Mr. John Edwards.

AN Enquiry into ſeveral Remakable Texts of the Old and New Teſtament which contain ſome Difficulty in them, with a Probable Reſolution of them, in two Vol. 8°.

A Diſcourſe concerning the *Authority*, *Stile* and *Perfection* of the Books of the Old and New Teſtament, with a Continued Illuſtration of ſeveral Difficult Texts throughout the whole Work. In three Vol. 8°.

Some Thoughts concerning the ſeveral Cauſes and Occaſions of Atheiſm, eſpecially in the Preſent Age, with ſome brief Reflections on Socinianiſm, and on a Late Book entitûled, *The Reaſonableneſs of Chriſtianity as deliver'd in the Scriptures.* 8°.

A Demonſtration of the *Exiſtence* and *Providence* of God from the Contemplation of the viſible Structure of the *Greater* and the *Leſſer World.* In two Parts.

Parts. The first, shewing the Excellent Contrivance of the *Heavens*, *Earth*, *Sea*, &c. The second, the wonderful Formation of the Body of Man.

Socinianism Unmask'd: A Discourse shewing the Unreasonableness of a Late Writer's Opinion, concerning the Necessity of only *One Article of Christian Faith*, and of his other Assertions in his Late Book Entituled, *The Reasonableness of Christianity as deliver'd in the Scriptures*, and in his *Vindication* of it; with a brief Reply to another (Professed) Socinian Writer.

All sold by Jonathan Robinson *at the* Golden Lyon, *and* John Wyat *at the* Rose *in St.* Paul's *Church-yard.*